Sergey Izmestyev

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE

English Edition

MONOGRAPH

2025

UDC 340.1 [321.1+316.3+322.2]
LBC 67.02
DOI 10.15862/53MNNPM25

Translated by Oksana Chernikova, edited by Yuri Petrov

Izmestyev Sergey.
Global Perspective : monograph. — M. : World of science, 2025. — 492 p.
ISBN 978-5-908044-73-8 (printed book)

This study focuses on the transformation of social relations, and the institutions of state and law that regulate them, in the context of international and socio-media globalisation, and the growth of societal connectivity driven by technological advancements.

The study examines society (social order), the state, and law from historical and functional perspectives. It considers the phenomena of the ritualisation of state functions lost through globalisation ("the ritualistic state"), the "appropriation" of state sovereignty by interest groups, and the transfer of people's sovereignty to transnational structures and global oligarchic power.

The existing social order, manifested through politics and markets, and based on the biological principle of the struggle for survival, is seen as the main cause of social crisis and consistent loss of sovereignty.

As an alternative to the implementation of biological principles that threaten humanity with extinction in the social sphere, the study proposes a model for the development of global civil society based on networked socio-media globalisation. This model is founded on common traditional, humanistic and spiritual values of civilisation, recognised human rights and freedoms. It is supplemented by the right to free dialogue on the Web (the right to freedom of communication) and freedom of access to means of communication (the right to the Internet). Such norms would be initiated and implemented by global civil society.

The study offers a list of, and analysis into, supranational spiritual principles and traditions that could form the basis of a global spiritual social order and higher law.

The global civil society in itself is considered as a world information community that can organise and regulate itself based on the principle of rational integration and shared values, goals and traditions.

ResearcherID Web of Science: HLV-7896-2023; https://orcid.org/0009-0006-1991-5309

www.izmestyev.org

Published and distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) International Public License.

ISBN 978-5-908044-73-8 **Copyright © Sergey Izmestyev, 2025**

I am grateful to all the volunteers who worked on this and the previous book. I am proud that we are all spiritually connected to the great land of Omsk in Siberia.

I really appreciate my family and friends, as well as my colleagues from different parts of our closely connected world, whose thoughts and advice inspired me to take on this research.

To everyone who believes

CONTENTS

FOREWORD 7en

AUTHOR'S NOTE 13en

INTRODUCTION 16en

CHAPTER I. THE REGRESSION OF STATES IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION 19en

CHAPTER II. CRISIS OF POLITICS. SOCIAL ORDER 49en

APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM OF CHOOSING BETWEEN RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL ALTERNATIVES (PHILOSOPHICAL DIGRESSION) 67en

CHAPTER III. SOCIETY, LAW: VIOLENCE AND INEQUALITY 77en

CHAPTER IV. LAW, SOCIAL ORDER AND GLOBAL SOCIETY 90en

CHAPTER V. GLOBAL SPIRITUAL PRINCIPLES 111en

CHAPTER VI. SPIRITUAL LAW AND THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH 142en

CHAPTER VII. GLOBAL LAW AND SPIRITUAL SOCIAL ORDER 176en

CONCLUSION (FINDINGS) 207en

Bibliography 215en
Books, monographs 215en
In English 215en
In Russian 217en
Articles in periodicals and anthologies 219en
In English 219en
In German 220en
In Russian 220en
Web resources 221en
In English 221en
In Russian 222en
Regulatory and official acts 222en

"Lux sit"
("Let there be Light", Latin)

FOREWORD

After reading my book *Global Alternative* many people have said that there is a lot to understand and explain about what is happening in the world. They then almost always ask what can be done about it. How can we stop modern society from drifting towards chaos? What is causing it, and what does it threaten us with? Reflecting on these practical questions led to this study, which was carried out between 2023 and 2025.

The advent of the internet and its wireless version has made it clear that the world will never be the same again. A major factor in the impact of technology is the increasing connectivity between people around the world. This phenomenon of increasing global connectivity was first described by the British sociologist A. Giddens at the end of the last century (Giddens, Sutton, 2016, pp. 14-16).

History shows that human consciousness truly desires to communicate with others. This urge was instilled in us by evolution as a guarantee of survival in a complex and perilous world. We could argue that communication is the most powerful "drug" for the brain. This urge, this natural instinct, should not be underestimated.

The constant urge to communicate drives the development of communication technologies. Messengers and social networks are being replaced by new forms of global communication: metaverses, neurointerfaces and much more. The essence of communication is not only the exchange of knowledge or useful information, but, to a greater

extent, the exchange of sensations, feelings and emotions. This is an ancient process that our distant ancestors engaged in when they painted the walls of their stone dwellings. Today, neurointerface research is bringing science one step closer to enabling such mutual exchange at the subconscious level. Undoubtedly, network connectivity is evolving from the exchange of information and audiovisual content to the exchange of feelings, emotions and sensations. This will be the global web of the near future.

This is wonderful! After all, at the heart of human understanding lies the capacity for empathy and compassion, which we have successfully developed as a legacy from our primate ancestors. This technological advancement could mark the beginning of global understanding and empathy, what spiritual teachings refer to as "love of neighbour". For the first time in history, we have the tools to realise this great spiritual principle.

Clearly, the social order and the normative social order that ensures it — based on intraspecific competition for survival, which has transformed into political and economic competition driven by animal instinct — condemns us to the depletion of vital resources and mutual destruction. This is how the history of all species that dominated the planet before us ended, turning evolution into a graveyard.

Clearly, any form of fundamentalism, isolationism or nationalism, with all its attributes — nations, states, borders, defences, politicians, leaders, enslavement, conquest, the sharing of resources and territories — is leading humanity to mutual destruction and extinction through the depletion of the resource base and the struggle for what is left. This is simply the fulfilment of an instinctive bioprogramme leading to inevitable extinction.

A rational integration of human society for the sake of common survival and development — a common conquest of the future through mutual assistance and cooperation on a global scale — is an alternative to such a bleak outlook. Let us call this the "global perspective".

This approach does not imply preserving the system of appropriation and exploitation or competition for resources and territories in the form of politics and markets. This explains the fierce attempts of ruling interest groups, who have appropriated the sovereignty of peoples, to break new global relations and prevent the formation of a global public sphere and a new global civil society. They persistently and unsuccessfully try to colonise the internet and organise bans, censorship and the persecution of activists.

These attempts by ruling groups to organise chaos and mistrust have become a desperate attempt to resist the global transformation of society from disparate, "imagined" communities (according to B. Anderson) into a global public community. This may explain the man-made pandemics and international conflicts of the last decade.

The paradox is that, under the slogans of "the end of globalisation", "the return of the state", nationalism, fundamentalism and isolationism, politicians demonstrate their inability to address global challenges and threats, whether natural, such as climate change and pandemics, or social, such as armed conflicts and rising crime rates. This is because politicians and global market actors are unable to work together rationally, which is at the heart of the competitive, biological paradigm of politics and the market economy.

Since the end of the last century, technologies that facilitate global information exchange and connectivity

have been referred to as "technologies of freedom". They create conditions for unifying and jointly confronting the political and economic elite that divide and rule society.

Technologies have more than once altered the direction of human development. In fact, we could argue that they have set us apart from other biological species. What would have happened if our common ancestor had not picked up a stone or a stick?

However, millennia of evolution have not changed our fundamental nature. The duality of human consciousness leaves us free to choose between animal instinct and rational, moral behaviour. This allows our collective will to determine whether we choose a path of extinction or prosperity. This is nowhere better expressed than in humanity's spiritual heritage — the religions and traditions of peoples and the shared values of faith and humanism on which our spirituality and culture are based.

As we evolve, it becomes increasingly clear that our spiritual and cultural heritage is more and more justified by scientific knowledge and understanding. We are coming closer to realising our place and role in the universe and choosing between ordinary extinction and becoming a civilisation that conquers time and space.

Throughout our history, which spans hundreds of thousands of years, the human species has chosen development over degradation, unity over mutual destruction and a shared, rational future over extinction. Each time, this choice has required us to overcome the limitations of outdated systems of relationships, such as kinship, slavery, absolutism, racism, exploitation and discrimination. The condition for overcoming these limits has always been technology: the technology of the future

and of freedom. This technology is the fruit of the human mind, and perhaps of divine inspiration, and has allowed us to take a step forward in our development.

Each such step was a choice, driven by the collective desire of society to expand its scope through new relations between peoples, building a common public sphere according to J. Habermas (Habermas, 2017, pp. 81-82). This was the result of information and cultural exchanges within world religions, and the emergence of printed matter, mass media and data exchange networks. Society itself, the peoples, has always taken the initiative to change relations between people. At the same time, ruling minorities have always tried to resist change and maintain the status quo in their favour. This has been the cause of social reforms and revolutions.

Society has always sought to communicate and develop appropriate technologies to change the social and economic order when it inhibits unity and development. Marx saw this as a contradiction between the ruling and working classes, but these processes are clearly ongoing in both pre- and post-class societies in the modern world.

From the first contacts between groups of ancient palaeoanthropes to the present day, humanity has moved steadily towards unification (globalisation), expanding communication and creating a public sphere on a planetary scale. To this end, communication technologies have been constantly created, from cave paintings and the domestication of the horse to modern air travel and the Internet.

By creating a shared space for instantaneous interaction that encompasses information, culture and the public sphere, we are returning to the primary form of social organisation

on a global scale: the community. This community is based on equal, open and public interaction through direct democracy when solving common problems. In fact, Habermas' "public sphere" is simply the community. This primary form of social organisation is offered to the world by traditional Abrahamic religions, which contain the colossal experience of previous generations. Is this a coincidence?

In our century, the exploration and development of the planet has reached its limits, and information exchange networks are striving for universal coverage, expanding every day. Artificial intelligence is penetrating all areas of knowledge and information accumulated by civilisation. Online translation systems on social media enable people to communicate freely, regardless of their language. The moment of "singularity" in human self-awareness is approaching: a time when everyone can connect with everyone else and be aware of common problems simultaneously. This technological and historical opportunity allows us to change the social order and reflect it throughout the world.

Many scientists, thinkers, philosophers and spiritual leaders are calling for change. The question is: how can we achieve this, and what social and legal mechanisms need to be put in place?

This work is the author's modest attempt to provide a clear answer to this question...

AUTHOR'S NOTE

This book should, of course, be viewed in the context of my 2023 publication, *Global Alternative* (Izmestyev, 2023), which includes articles on the crisis of the modern state and politics in light of globalisation, as well as the phenomena of the ritualistic state and the transfer of sovereignty to globalised transnational structures. An approach was proposed to overcome the crisis of "politics and markets" through a strong-willed global law-making act that would unite people via social media into a new global public sphere of global society. This approach was developed in an attempt to provide a constructive response to the challenges and threats posed by the era of global connections and technological breakthroughs.

So, what is this book about? It definitely is not about politics, but rather about the threat posed by its current form. Therefore, the last thing one would want is for it to be evaluated on political grounds, or to be categorised in terms of liberal or conservative views.

There is no notorious "conspiracy theory" here either. Conspiracies have undoubtedly been and will continue to be a political tool, and their study is the historians' bread and butter.

Here, social transformations are considered to be the result of the purposeful collective action of organised interest groups (in accordance with M. Weber's theory) and expressed in organised violence (in accordance with C. Tilly's theory).

This work aims to identify the causes of global challenges and threats, as well as possible options for specific actions and solutions connected thereto.

This also involves honest and substantive discussions about true values and traditions, which form the fundamental principles of our civilisation and could provide a basis for global consensus. Public figures from various countries have been discussing this a lot lately.

However, since giving up and accepting the situation as hopeless is not an option, we should remember that the reverse of Descartes' axiom "*Cogito ergo sum*" (I think, therefore I am) is "As long as I am, I think", and also "While I breathe, I hope" (*Dum spiro spero*, Latin).

With this in mind, every decision and action should be preceded by awareness of and understanding of its necessity, as well as analysis and selection of worthy options.

This book is an attempt to understand that, by uniting will and consciousness, we can find solutions through joint efforts. It is also a call to reflect on what we all need to understand and do.

The most important thing to help us in this is to realise that, to find truly great solutions, we must go beyond the concepts and limitations we create for ourselves and consider as "sacred and inviolable".

The simplest approach is to view the situation as if we were aliens from another civilisation, revealing the insignificance and sorrow of mundane life.

Thinking outside the box has always yielded new, life-saving solutions, requiring a reflective observer — like the Creator above the chaos.

If we can perceive, reflect on, and discuss problems and contradictions with each other, and share our faith in the future, we will find the right answer.

This work presents a variety of perspectives on existing globalisation-related problems, and therefore the author

has not been able to avoid repeating certain judgements in relation to different aspects and situations. This may not be such a bad thing; otherwise, the reader would have to remember many statements or refer back to earlier assumptions instead of taking a fresh look at the problem being discussed.

Somebody may argue that the proposed approach to the problem and its solution is not traditional or widely accepted by modern science or legal tradition. However, the fact that hundreds of accepted doctrines and millions of legal acts over thousands of years have not led to even some of the biblical commandments being observed does not mean that we should not look for other ways.

Unfortunately, I am not an expert in specific fields such as physics, anthropology, biology, physiology or psychology. Therefore, if anything I have said is inaccurate, I hope the reader will be gracious.

In any case, a journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step. We are all bound to be fellow-travellers, because the future is waiting for us, and it does not wait.

INTRODUCTION

When assessing modern society, the main question we ask is: what is our shared perspective or destiny? Where are we going? Will we overcome the contradictions that plague us, or will we perish in an endless struggle with nature and our fellow human beings?

The answer lies in understanding what motivates us.

If we consider humanity in the broadest sense, we cannot assume that its progressive development is the result of chance and chaos. Firstly, history is a series of changes that have led to the development of human knowledge and technology, evolving from primitive to modern science and technology. Secondly, it is clear that the human community is constantly expanding and becoming more globalised through increased communication, from families and clans to the modern information society.

Consequently, following sociologists, we can speak of social order as universal modes of interaction and solidarity (E. Durkheim) or competition (T. Hobbes), based on shared values and norms (T. Parsons) embedded in society's collective consciousness — its "spirit" or spiritual values.

The main actor and material expression of social order — the spokesman for "values and norms" — is considered to be the state, which has adopted values and norms from religious ideas and traditional ideals. As the famous American sociologist Talcott Parsons says in his seminal work *The System of Modern Societies*, it is worth noting that the foundations of social normative order are always expressed "in religious terms" (Parsons, 1971, p. 9) and "the values of society are rooted in religion" (Parsons, 1971,

p. 98). The consequence of the secularisation of society, he says, is always "the destruction of the moral or value consensus" (Parsons, 1971, p. 99).

A similar idea of turning to religion can be found in the studies of the famous British researcher, biologist and sociologist, Robert Ardrey. We will refer to his work, *The Social Contract*, many times. In the main conclusions of this work he says: "A set of common assumptions, common dedications, common assurances, of rules and regulations, even considering the limitations of Homo sapiens, remains someday possible. As all of our parochial dedications have been eroded by the wash of the sciences, still a religion unassailable by the sciences exists as a goal worthy of contemporary ambition" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 380).

The idea of referring to the social order and its reflection in law as the cause and basis for the regulation of legal relations at the global level is due to the works of fundamental researchers of the last century, including Pyotr Kropotkin, Vladimir Vernadsky, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Talcott Parsons, Robert Ardrey and Jürgen Habermas.

The idea of the transformation of the state in conditions of globalisation is considered here on the basis of the views of contemporary scholars such as Charles Tilly, Pierre Bourdieu and Benedict Anderson.

Particular attention is given to the origins of competition and collective aggression based on the work of the physiologist Konrad Lorenz, the psychoanalyst Carl Jung, and the Soviet criminologist Juri Antonjan.

This study extensively references the works and conclusions of Vatican theological scholars and Holy See leaders, as a deep understanding of biblical spiritual principles is impossible without them.

In particular, I would like to highlight the influence of the concept of the moral state of the contemporary scientist Sergey Baburin on this work (Baburin, 2020). His writings and our discussions about them became the starting point for the search for social and legal mechanisms for combining spiritual and legal principles in the regulation of public life.

When we speak of social order, we are referring to states as spaces and ways of existence. States define and regulate social relations within their territory through legal norms, and also establish the order of relations with each other by creating norms of international law and principles of international order.

Undoubtedly, both internal and external relations develop within the framework of politics and the market economy, which are becoming increasingly global as cultural and trade ties grow. Let us try to answer how this relates to law, which is supposed to reflect common universal principles and values — the basis of social order? Does state pragmatism and competition lead to chaos in social relations, as it is happening with the modern state?

CHAPTER I.
THE REGRESSION OF STATES IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBAL SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION

In the context of accelerating globalisation processes in the economic and social spheres, states and societies that either did not exist on the world map less than a hundred years ago or were not full-fledged actors in international politics are increasingly influencing international politics.

Following the collapse of empires and the colonial system in the 20th century, national liberation movements in former colonies granted independence to over a hundred peoples and territories.

By the beginning of the 18th century, the dominant form of social organisation had become the Westphalian-type sovereign state, which, as a result of popular revolutions, took the form of a democratic republic.

The European democratic state, based on a constitution and the recognition of fundamental human rights and freedoms, parliamentary representation, separation of powers, and a developed local government, became the standard model of social organisation. It should be noted that the term "European state" is a convention that entirely refers also to developed democratic states on other continents.

When peoples and territories gained sovereignty, the European state model was exported, and a template of the European state system was automatically applied to other societies with the support of more developed countries. This is manifested in the similarity of the norms and provisions of the constitutions of many states.

In political and economic terms, such "exported" states had not been significant players in the international arena for a long time, until the end of the 20th century. They remained economically dependent on former metropolises or leading states, and were under their cultural and political influence. The World Bank terms them "developing countries" according to their per-capita GDP. Under the tutelage (or patronage) of the world's leading powers, they were expected to develop not only their own economies but also public democratic institutions and civil society. Developed countries and international organisations provided substantial resources for this purpose.

The paradox of the process of exporting a state system was that, from the point of view of the international law that had emerged as a result of the Second World War, the new states acquired the status of equal sovereign participants in international relations from the moment of their establishment. They acquired the full range of international legal guarantees of their independence without any requirements regarding their level of economic or social development, or the existence of democratic institutions, civil society, or guarantees to protect internationally recognised rights and freedoms within their borders. The only conditions for recognition of their sovereignty were a declaration of independence and recognition of their statehood by any state.

According to the principles of international law formed by the leading countries of the world, the very fact of establishing statehood in a territory provides its political regime with full international legal guarantees of sovereignty and non-interference by other subjects of international law on the principle of unconditional recognition.

This has resulted in the technical equality of territories and political regimes with diverse characteristics and levels of state and social institution development.

Although the economic and political influence of these new states was often negligible and dependent on others, it determined a tolerant attitude towards their imperfections as "developing" societies and "third world" states.

The sharp acceleration of the processes of globalisation in the economic, commercial, financial and cultural spheres at the beginning of our XXI century, together with the export of technology, has increased the influence of these countries on the world economy and international politics, as well as on the very image of the state of the modern world, which is of interest for the research by state-legal science and for determining the image of the future social order.

Socio-media globalisation, which has emerged on the basis of global dialogue on the Internet, has included societies all over the world on an equal footing in a single information and communication space, the emerging global public sphere (according to J. Habermas) (Habermas, 1989), ensuring their involvement in the formation of the global agenda of human development.

Natural processes of cultural global integration and formation of the global public sphere through discussion network services based on authentic internationalism, equality, publicity, multiculturalism and mutual respect (socio-media globalisation) deserve the highest praise as a factor of building a global civil society, a common consciousness of humanity.

However, the processes of international globalisation at the level of international politics and associations of states,

as well as the formation of global markets, pose serious threats to world peace and security.

The aggressive, competitive approach, inherited from past foreign policies, bloc thinking, and strong lobbying by states and their alliances in defence of economic interests, has led to a redistribution of political and economic influence, increased competition, and military confrontation. "It is this type of (international) globalisation that can rightly be called a 'union of unequals', in which the larger players of the 'civilised world' often solve their problems at the expense of weaker partners, imposing their political and economic will on them. ... Moreover, by the will of politicians who drive these processes, such globalisation often degenerates into a means of expansion for some of its participants" (Izmestyev, 2023, p. 23en).

The simplest solution in this situation is to strengthen the role of international law and to form the global constitution, "ius cosmopoliticum" (I. Kant) (Kant, 1965*c*, pp. 257-311), "supreme norm" (H. Kelsen) (Kelsen, 1960, p. 336), "norms accepted by all in the perspective of everyone" (J. Habermas) (Habermas, 1998, p. 33) by the emerging global network of civil society on the basis of common values and interests.

Foreign policy, as an environment of competitive interaction between states, or rather their political regimes, in the struggle for political influence, economic dominance and exploitation of resources, inevitably appears on the way to such a solution.

Three multidirectional processes can be distinguished here. European integration in the context of the formation of the EU, with the transfer of part of sovereignty to the transnational governance structures to be formed; the

processes of economic integration in North America; and regional alliances of states to protect markets from the expansion of the transnational corporations (TNCs) associated with the world's leading economies.

It is clear that the quality of international interaction depends to a large extent not on formal equality of status, but on the real potential of its participants. However, there are no official criteria for the effectiveness and quality of modern states.

The problem of finding criteria for assessing the quality of modern states is mainly addressed by independent expert organisations.

Until 2014, the US non-governmental organisation Found for Peace (FFP) used the classification of modern states previously proposed by German researchers, according to which some "problem" states are subdivided into "weak", "fragile", "degenerating or failing", "failed or collapsed" (Schneckener, 2003).

Currently, since 2014, this organisation has published the annual "State Resilience Index" for 154 states and the "Fragile States Index" for 179 states.

The resilience index uses seven groups of indicators, such as

- Economy (economic diversification, business environment, development dynamics and innovation, physical infrastructure development, capital flows, management level);
- Environment (pollution, health of oceans and fisheries, agricultural productivity, ecosystem health, biodiversity, long-term climate stability, clean energy, water availability);
- Inclusion of all categories of citizens in the public and state spheres (youth participation in public affairs,

political inclusion, access to finance, participation of different groups in public and political processes, access to economic resources, access to employment, protection against precarity);

- Individual capabilities (accessibility of nutrition, education, health care, wealth);

- Social cohesion (social capital, social relations, trust in the state);

- Civic space (engagement, accountability, development of democratic structures, protection of human rights and civil liberties, access to information);

- State capacity (finances, government effectiveness, disaster risk reduction, public health, education outcomes, rule of law, freedom from corruption) ("State Resilience Index" for 154 states).

To assess state fragility, the FFP Conflict Assessment System (CAST) methodology is used, which was developed by the Foundation as a way to better understand and measure conflict drivers and dynamics in complex environments in order to assess societal tensions and the degree of pressure on state institutions ("Fragile States Index" for 179 states).

As can be seen from the above, the effectiveness and stability of states are usually assessed using a wide range of indicators of socio-economic and environmental well-being and territorial development.

This approach is valid if a state is understood as a total of territories and populations with certain conditions and opportunities, and states are understood as peoples and territories in the broadest sense. Or when it is necessary to recognise that all the merits of a people and the territory they inhabit, including climate and ecology, are solely the merits of the state that has been formed in that place.

If the second statement is true, then states must be, if not eternal, then quite ancient institutions, something that very few island powers can boast. Most modern states have come into being in the last two or three hundred years, the product of the decay or semi-decay of empires of the past. The effectiveness of many of them is quite questionable, since "many Third World governments have always experienced great difficulty in taking violence out of the hands of people and organizations and monopolizing it in their own… Among them, some are interested in stirring up trouble for their neighbors. Others seek to promote a variety of ideological and religious causes, while others still are ruled by people who are greedy for money and not too scrupulous about the ways of getting it. Thus it is virtually certain that, at any one time, at least several can be found which are ready to assist terrorists, if not against everybody, then at least against some," notes the Israeli researcher of the genesis of states Martin van Creveld (Creveld, 1999, pp. 394, 402).

In fact, the states themselves, represented by their ruling groups, have always wanted to impose on society the no-alternative perception of the state as an eternal and immutable institution, rooted in the beginning of time. As the famous French researcher Pierre Bourdieu said, "we risked applying to the state a 'state thinking'", he also emphasized that "our thinking, the very structures of consciousness by which we construct the social world and the particular object that is the state, are very likely the product of the state itself" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 3).

If we consider the state as a social institution, then from the point of view of modern jurisprudence, it would be correct to use the "three-element approach of the continental

European constitutional, juridical, and state theory traditions" proposed by the British researcher Bob Jessop, based on Weber's approach, to define the concept of the state in terms of its three obligatory elements.

"The three elements he identifies are:

(1) a politically organised coercive, administrative and symbolic apparatus endowed with both general and specific powers... (state power, state apparatus)...

(2) a clearly delineated core territory under the more or less undisputed and continuous control of the state apparatus (state territory);

(3) a permanent or stable population on which the political authority and decisions of the state are binding" (Jessop, 2016, p. 26).

Hence it follows that the quality and effectiveness of the state is closely related to the development of its institutions and the public administration functions they perform.

From a historical perspective the state can be seen as an instrument of competition and appropriation.

The very emergence of the state from the tribes and chiefdoms of antiquity was linked to the transfer of the right to legitimate use of force against the population (social order and state system) and other states (defence and war) to organised groups struggling to establish a legal order of governance.

Competition between tribes for resources and territory was a natural continuation of the evolution of the species, a continuation of biological natural selection. Ancient society can be described as a multitude of atomised communities with a closed communication space, between which there was no stable connection and sufficient communication

due to linguistic, cultural, religious, ethnic differences, primitive economy and isolated locations.

Their interaction and confrontation was part of an intraspecific competition, often violent, expressed by Thomas Hobbes' formula of "struggle of all against all" (*bellum omnium contra omnes*, Latin) (Hobbes, 2008).

Under such conditions, according to the theory of collective action, leadership was inevitably assigned to the strongest and most aggressive individuals, well-organised groups that translated the leader's power into control over society, resources and the economy. These groups, the ruling elite, presented themselves to society as moderators and regulators of inter-community interaction, guaranteeing stability and security.

In this sense, M. Creveld's view of ancient empires as chiefdoms that grew through the violent conquest of territories, which he calls pre-state formations, is interesting (Creveld, 1999, pp. 36-37).

Without a fully-fledged common communicative (and even more so, discussion, public) space, created and maintained exclusively by force, mostly ritual, these empires — "prisons of peoples", according to the definition of the leader of the Russian Revolution V. Lenin (quoted from Matyushkin, 1954), where, in the words of M. Creveld, "the abstract state being absent, the entire structure amounted to little more than a gigantic racket, one in which the emperor combined with his servitors, whatever their precise status, to fleece the remainder of the population" (Creveld, 1999, p. 46), had weak internal cohesion, imposing, in the words of P. Bourdieu, "a very moderate loyalty towards the state" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 188), and eventually disintegrated.

Against the background of this process, the emergence of world religious teachings and centres of spirituality was not accidental. Based on common natural, spiritual and traditional principles, they became the centre of the formation of a common socio-cultural space, dialogue and communication in the Middle Ages.

The public sphere they created was based on common values and principles for regulating social relations, a common language as a means of communication and a common spiritual literature. Religious centres and their spiritual leaders assumed the role of regulators of international relations, acting as arbiters in emerging conflicts. At the same time, spiritual and religious principles and traditions acted as a kind of uncodified global constitution, guaranteeing a common approach and scope of rights for all, partly thanks to transnational religious law and legal procedures. This was a prototype of future international law.

Due to the multiplicity of spiritual teachings and world cultures, there were several such centres, which actually divided human society into several civilisations. It is true that in the Middle Ages the level of globalisation on a religious basis was not sufficient for a global transformation of society. The reason for this was the small number of educated people and the lack of mass communication (literature, press, mass media), as well as the insufficient level of population mobility, economic ties and cultural exchanges. The majority of the population was illiterate, did not know the languages of the world religions and lived in isolation, including cultural isolation. Class and property stratification only added to the process of isolation.

However, the need for internal and external violence in the distribution of territory and resources between and within communities did not disappear. Throughout the Middle Ages, the power lost by the ancient empires was gradually appropriated by community chiefs, military leaders and their cronies, who later became monarchs and aristocracies. The whole history of the formation of monarchies in Europe, according to the historian and medievalist Steve Fuller, can be reduced to a constant struggle of local elites with the power and influence of transnational religions (quoted from Sysoev, 2020).

The religious public sphere was opposed to the idea of a nation-state based on a monolingual communication environment and cultural identity. In this construct, the state itself is presented as a union of communities and estates, where the state power (represented by the ruler) acts as a moderator of inter-community and inter-societal interaction, as an actor of domestic and foreign policy.

At this stage there is "the political transformation of society", which is expressed in the appropriation of the monopoly of power and information by the elites (Izmestyev, 2023, p. 101en).

Many researchers associate the emergence of the state as a socio-political institution with the emergence of monarchical power. At the same time, the state itself is often defined by the concept of a specialised apparatus with the right to use legal (M. Weber) and, above all, symbolic violence, "as the monopoly of symbolic violence is the condition for possession of the exercise of the monopoly of physical violence itself" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 4).

Initially, such an apparatus was organised in an estate-based manner, when the monarch’s entourage

exercised certain administrative powers on his behalf. In the concept of the absolutist state of the Westphalian type, the state itself was regarded as the embodiment of the will of the omnipotent ruler — the sovereign; the state emanated from him and was personified by him (ritual representation of power).

The emergence of absolutism as the removal of transnational religious organisations from the management of society by local elites, the monopolisation of power and property in the hands of a narrow aristocratic class, the replacement of religious and traditional law by legislative arbitrariness quickly led to a social crisis and an era of popular uprisings and revolutions. This was facilitated, according to the just opinion of J. Habermas, by the emergence at the national level of an open discussion and communicative public sphere based on book publishing and the printed press (Habermas, 1989, pp. 14-27).

The peoples, having realised their commonality in the bourgeois public sphere, demanded participation in the management of public life, fair and independent justice, constitutional guarantees of natural rights and individual freedoms previously guaranteed by religion and tradition. The doctrine of popular sovereignty of J.-J. Rousseau (Rousseau, 1998) was opposed to the representation of the estates and represented the revival of ancient traditions of communal popular power on a new level.

The adopted constitutional acts restored most of the natural, traditional and religious principles and norms of social life to the basis of legal regulation: liberty, justice, peace ("*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*", the motto of the French Revolution). It can be said that popular representation revived the democracy of the community and that

constitutionalism was intended to replace the dominance of the original traditional and religious principles.

The idea of popular sovereignty is closely linked to the change in the purpose of the state's existence as a social institution. In the interests of the society proclaimed by the sovereign (the people bound by a single discursive public sphere), social functions and obligations were assigned to the state. In the concept of the social contract proposed by J.-J. Rousseau (Rousseau, 1998), society's expenditure on maintaining the state apparatus required it to provide services in various fields (law and order, education, health, culture, etc.). From that moment on, the welfare of society rather than the realisation of the will of the sovereign ruler became the idea of the state's activity.

An important feature of the democratic state was the separation of power and property, when the institution of state property and the treasury, managed by a professional bureaucracy, appeared, whereas before the property of the state was formally the property of the monarch's family.

With the development of capitalism at the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, we can speak of a process of appropriation of the state by financial and industrial elites (formation of the deep state) through the "privatization of the public sphere" described by J. Habermas (Habermas, 1989, pp. 151, 175, 180, 202-203, 214), the creation of a quasi-public sphere by the broadcasting media under their control, the control of the electoral process by the media ("mediacracy", "audience democracy", "democracy of spectators", in the words of Bernard Manin, a well-known political scientist and author of these concepts) (Manin, 1997, p. 223), the financing of electoral campaigns, the bribery of officials and the abuse of executive power, the replacement

of spirituality by propaganda, of law by legislation and of history by historical myth.

At the end of the 20th century, these processes were aggravated by the flow of popular sovereignty appropriated by the deep state into the hands of globalised financial and industrial groups, transnational corporations, the "global oligarchic power" formed by them, and globalised crime (Shestakov, 2012).

This has been greatly facilitated by factors such as politics and markets. In the basis of their organisation the ancient principle of competitive struggle has remained, where the key to success is not only the activity of the participants, but also the degree of their aggression and greed, when "authority itself is thrown into the struggle for authority" (Lindblom, 1977, pp. 119-120). The ideal leader in such a system of relations is a politician who demonstrates the maximum suppression of competitors, and a successful entrepreneur is an entrepreneur obsessed with the appropriation of property. Aristotle called all this "pleonexia", i.e. a manifestation of aggression, self-interest, greed and injustice (*πλεονεκτες*, Greek), by which he meant the unjust "appropriation of 'other people's' goods (material or otherwise)", "shameful gain", "unjust distribution of due" (Aristotle, 2011).

This Pleonexerian paradigm is a legacy of the animal struggle for survival (according to T. Hobbes: "all against all"), an intraspecific struggle within the framework of evolutionary natural selection, which has been transferred to the social level.

Inherited from the animal world, this competitive approach at the early stage of the development of society was effective in the struggle for the development of

resources and territories between peoples, accompanied by constant wars and conquests, for which, according to the British researcher Charles Tilly, states were originally created (Tilly, 1985, p. 170).

Religious and traditional law acted as a natural regulator of aggressive competition, aiming to preserve the balance of interests and prevent complete mutual destruction. Unfortunately, this was successfully "neutralised" by monarchs during the era of absolutism and the secularisation of society, and it did not experience a revival on an international scale during the era of popular sovereignty.

The elimination of the globalised spiritual tradition served as a condition for the formation of aggressive totalitarian regimes in the early 20th century, which led the world into a global military catastrophe due to the degradation of individual states, where social institutions were destroyed by political ones, state structures were replaced by party (political) structures, and the functions of coercion and violence were carried out not so much by the state apparatus as by political paramilitary organisations loyal to leaders personally. This allows us to compare the state of such societies with pre-state forms of social organisation — chiefdoms or, above all, the empires of antiquity.

Today it is obvious that in the modern global society, where the military potential of states is growing with the scientific and technological progress, in conditions of almost complete exploitation of territories and resources of the planet, the continuation of the biological programme of natural selection (intraspecific competition, because interspecific competition has long been won in the course of evolution) will inevitably lead mankind to the same end

as all previously dominant biological species on the planet — to extinction.

In fact, the highly competitive approach in the struggle for power (politics) and property (markets), which is based on the social embodiment of animal intraspecific competition (natural selection), creates the conditions for the subordination of society to the interests of individual global groups (clans) fighting for world leadership in the political and economic spheres to the point of complete mutual destruction. This can only be countered by changing the social order to one based on law and the common values of humanity.

Many societies of developing countries are characterised by the phenomenon that in the absence of developed institutions of civil society (or their suppression by the political regime) and the dominance of international law, conditions are created for a kind of degradation of states, their de-civilisation, the return of society to a pre-state form. Similarly, in modern psychology and criminology the phenomenon of the "syndrome of return (barbarisation)" is described, the denial of civilisation by the human personality (Antonjan, 2015*a*, pp. 92, 184).

Observing these processes, we can speak of a kind of regression of the state. The condition for such a regression can be called the revival of "popular absolutism" at the beginning of the 20th century, which Carl Schmitt warned against in his work Political Theology (Schmitt, 2000, pp. 44-45).

In fact, the fetishisation of the sovereignty of the state, appropriated by the elite and the politicians, together with its unboundedness by law, leads to the absolutism of the politicians (political regime), which can be conventionally called "absolutism".

Furthermore, under the conditions of globalisation, when the appropriated "absolutism" flows into global transnational structures, the functions of the state are replaced by the activities of transnational corporations, with only the ritual framework of the state actually preserved, and the regulatory functions lost due to globalisation are replaced by bureaucratic and media rituals — the phenomenon of the ritualistic state emerges. At the same time, society is slipping back into the pre-state condition of ancient primitive empires, where the racketeer rulers are no longer military leaders, but international financial and industrial groups of influence.

Among the signs of the degradation of the state are the following:

- The states' loss of their functions and powers due to globalisation and their forced transfer to private sector organisations (the transfer of state powers in local governments and public non-profit institutions is not included here);

- The combination of power and property, public and private interests;

- The amalgamation of powers that gives the executive branch of government legislative or judicial powers and the power to control the law and the judiciary;

- Substitution of the interests of the state (the people) for the group interests of political, economic, ethnic or religious groups;

- Bureaucratisation and ritualisation of state functions, the ritualistic state.

In his book *The Rise and Decline of the State*, the historian and philosopher M. Creveld points out that inherently state sectors such as defence and security have

been steadily transferred to private, often international, companies. For example, in the United States alone, by the mid-1970s, the number of people employed by private security companies was twice as high as the number of people employed by the police and security services (Creveld, 1999, p. 404). Throughout the world, despite international condemnation of mercenary practices, the number and size of private military companies is growing and they are becoming a real military force in international conflicts.

The recent COVID-19 epidemic has shown how easily the health systems of many countries transfer their powers to international organisations of supranational management in this field.

In many countries there is a growth of private education services, while this sector is financed by the states on a residual basis.

More and more private projects are being implemented in the fields of transport and the development of municipal infrastructure.

In the United States in particular, there is an active process of privatisation even in the penal and correctional system.

At the same time, the tax burden in most countries is increasing, not decreasing (Creveld, 1999, p. 410).

M. Creveld states: "Thus the evidence is that, whether overtly and brazenly, or covertly and on the sky, the majority of modern states are demanding more and more while offering less and less… Whatever the precise processes, almost everywhere they have been accompanied by a declining willingness of states to take responsibility for their economies; provide social benefits; educate the

young; and even perform the elementary function of protecting their citizens against terrorism and crime, a task which at best is being shared with other organizations and at worst simply let go" (Creveld, 1999, pp. 410, 414).

The connection between power and property is both an explicit and a hidden process. On the one hand, the influence of TNC lobbies on governments is growing; on the other, corruption scandals are shaking the world with increasing frequency. Oligarchy has become an almost official phenomenon in many developing countries, even if it is not hidden from the public.

The lack of democratic standards in "third world" countries allows them to openly ignore the principles of separation of powers proclaimed in their own constitutions and laws. This allows heads of state to have "private" parliaments and courts.

A large number of societies are experiencing periods of dictatorship, in which the unlimited domination of certain ethnic groups (tribes), religious associations or even mafia clans (families, "criminal underground") is established under the slogan of the interests of the people (popular sovereignty) (Magyar, 2016).

A strong sign of the degradation of states is their ritualisation, the phenomenon of the ritualistic state.

It should be noted that the ritualistic component of the state is noted by many modern researchers. In a certain sense, the state is legitimised in the consciousness of society through symbols and rituals.

Speaking about the legitimate violence of the state apparatus, P. Bourdieu emphasises its "symbolic" (ritualistic) nature (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 7), notes that "the state also falls on the side of magic (according to E. Durkheim)" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 12), and says that "the birth of the

state is accompanied by a process of concentration of instruments of legitimation, as well as the development of a symbolic apparatus and symbolic rituals surrounding the royal power" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 66).

The use of rituals to justify the violent exploitation of society and the maintenance of power ("protection racket" according to Ch. Tilly (Tilly, 1985, p. 169) has its origins in the original legitimisation of the social power of rulers in the name of the Church, the transfer of sovereignty from the divine to medieval rulers.

However, after the absolutist Treaty of Westphalia, the violent liberation of rulers and aristocrats from the influence of transnational religions and religious law, the appropriators of states succeeded in skilfully replacing ecclesiastical rituals and symbols with secular ones, spirituality with ideology, and the religious community with the nation ("imagined community" according to Benedict Anderson (Anderson, 1991, p. 25), thus transforming the state into a "civil religion" of J.-J. Rousseau's kind, who entitled chapter 8 of his work *On the Social Contract* as follows (Rousseau, 1998). Having granted their subjects "freedom" from religion, monarchical rulers cunningly obliged them to worship themselves instead.

The most extreme form of imposing official "civil religion" propaganda can be called the deification of the state, or "patriatheism". It is derived from the Greek words "*πατριά*" (pátria) meaning "fatherland" or "country", and "*Θεός*" (theós) meaning "god". When religion is replaced by a state cult, the state itself — usually associated with the political regime and the ruling elite — is imposed on the people in the form of a peculiar idol in the cult of "civil religion" (according to J.-J. Rousseau), demanding

the highest degree of worship and endless ritual sacrifices. It is not surprising that such idolatry leaves no room for genuine faith, spirituality, monotheism or the rejection of idol creation. This can be seen as a social regression from religious spirituality to neo-pagan practices similar to the cults of emperors in the Roman Empire and of pharaohs in ancient Egypt.

The loss of the real functions of governance due to the globalisation of regulatory spheres and the degradation of the state apparatus is not quickly recognised by the ritualistic state and is usually replaced by a ritual imitation of governance, bureaucratic rituals. Bureaucratisation itself is a managerial ritual that has accompanied the decline of states since the Roman Empire (the issues of the ritualistic state have been analysed in detail in Chapter II "Global Revolution and 'Ritualistic State'" of my work *Global Alternative*) (Izmestyev, 2023, p. 27en).

Ritualisation is also often expressed in ritual rule-making, i.e. in increasing acts of petty regulation of social life (to hide the real helplessness of the legislator). As M. Creveld notes: "Possibly by way of compensating for their growing impotence, many states have also developed a disturbing habit of meddling in the most minute details of people's lives... For example, by the late 1980s, the number of pages in the American Federal Register, the official journal publishing federal laws and regulations, was approaching the 100,000 mark, and they even controlled the shape of tubs in hotel rooms and the height of the jambs that could be put on their doors, nor did the agencies involved seem at all inclined to reduce their output after President Bush put a moratorium on new regulations in 1992. These

and countless other forms of intrusion can only lead to alienation and anger that is sometimes literally explosive" (Creveld, 1999, p. 410-411).

This degeneration of the state and the apparatus of legal coercion under global capitalism makes it nothing more than an instrument of appropriation of resources and exploitation of the population in the hands of the transnational elites that control it. This is confirmed by the tendency of the states to consistently abandon the social and regulatory commitments they made in the era of the popular revolutions, while the level of appropriation of resources and taxation is only increasing.

The researchers note: "In many instances the retreat of the state is voluntary. Such is the case, for example, when it sets out to evade its responsibilities by cutting back on welfare, social security, education, and the like; so also when it seeks to improve opportunities for trade by opening its borders, integrating its infrastructure with that of its neighbors, joining international organizations of various kinds, and submitting to such regulations as those organizations may lay down. In others it is involuntary: the product of vast economic, technological, and cultural forces which, although they affect different regions in different ways, are beyond the control even of the most powerful states, and which states can resist, if at all, only at the cost of being left behind as history bulldozes its way forward. Often, too, the process takes place by default. It is not so much a question of the state deciding to integrate or retreat as the slow erosion of the quality of the benefits which it can and does provide […] and in a growing number of places from Western and Eastern Europe all the way to the developing world, the state is not so much served and admired as endured and tolerated. The

days when, as used to be the case during the era of total war in particular, it could set itself up as a god on earth are clearly over" (Creveld, 1999, pp. 414, 417).

The use of rituals, or worse, ritualistic violence, by states (their political regimes) serves as a practice of appealing to the dark irrationality of individual and group (collective media rituals) consciousness. At their core is the same latent aggression, the competitive bioprogramme that drives societies to violence and ultimately threatens the extinction of our species.

Whereas democracy and equal public dialogue (public sphere) are based on rational human principles and lead to global peaceful and constructive cooperation.

Following this logic, we can assume that the weakening, appropriation and ritualisation of states, especially developing states, leading to the emergence of fundamentalism and isolationism, is a direct threat to the future of our civilisation.

All this allows us to speak of the signs of a deep crisis of the institution of the sovereign state, of the possible prospect of the loss of its functions and the return of society to the pre-state condition of a world empire or a global superstate of universal control and oppression for the purposes of total exploitation and appropriation of property by elites.

What is especially worrying is the fact that many people, especially in the "third world" countries, are losing their constructive image about the state as a social institution; respect for the state is being replaced by tolerance for exploitation and legal extortion, by neo-feudalism (when the population is considered by the regime as an object to be exploited, as a biological source), and the state is seen only as a "complex of rituals" (Corrigan, Sayer, 1985, p. 191).

It should be noted that the practice of delegating sovereignty in globalised spheres to the supranational level of governance in the EU makes it possible to effectively combine the sovereignty of its members to solve common problems, while preserving the dignified role of national states in this process as representatives of the interests of individual peoples. This experience deserves to be studied and has the potential to be extended as a viable alternative in modern conditions. However, as a regional phenomenon, it does not solve the problems of global development.

We can therefore speak of a crisis of the modern state as a social institution, which is reflected in the steady weakening of the world's leading states and the slowing down of the emergence of developing countries.

This is due to the inevitable increase in the pressure of globalisation processes on public institutions and, above all, to the lack of common standards and approaches to the quality and effectiveness of the state as a public institution.

Under these conditions, there is a risk of the degradation of states, the slide of societies into pre-state conditions, the suppression of developing countries by larger players or transnational structures, and the ultimate devaluation of the idea of the state in the eyes of society.

The assumptions made in recent years about the slowing down of globalisation and the renaissance of the sovereign state are only a misunderstanding of the consequences of the degradation of states, when their "brand" is used with a reactionary and populist agenda by other structures that have appropriated them.

Technological development has always had a transformative impact on social order. In modern conditions, it is impossible not to see that economic competition,

information exchange, politics and even armed conflicts can no longer exist in their previous form. The only way to return to previous relations would be to reject technological development — indeed, progress itself. This is both impossible on a global scale and disastrous at the local level.

The processes taking place at an international level cannot be considered in isolation from socio-media globalisation and the formation of a global public sphere and civil society based on online dialogue. This is because, together with cultural globalisation, it creates the conditions for the formation of a global civic consciousness, which absorbs the sovereignty of the peoples of individual nations. I have already suggested to call it a global transit of sovereignty (Izmestyev, 2023, p. 73en).

The socio-media globalisation and the global transit of sovereignty serve as a full precondition for the formation of global self-regulation mechanisms (global self-governance) through the adoption by direct voting on the Internet of global constitutional principles and legal norms accepted by all in the perspective of everyone, with the formation of the highest level of legal norms — global law on the basis of universally recognised human rights and freedoms, common humanistic, democratic and spiritual tradition, free access to the exchange of information and tools of such an exchange.

The law, based on centuries-old traditions and spiritual principles, accepted by all in the perspective of everyone, based on the collective inner conviction of the overwhelming majority, is a natural regulator of the common future global social order. Modern science speaks of its inevitable birth through network interconnection (Herbert, Fisher-Høyrem, 2021, p. 1). Under the conditions of the global order, law, its basic principles, are obliged to be global.

Only the subordination of all states to the supreme unified principles of global law (global constitutionalism), approved by humanity by direct vote on the Internet, initiated by global activist movements, when all accepted norms of international and national law, as well as all actions of authorities and governments will be in accordance with them, will make it possible to create a new just world order, a true expression of the principle of the rule of law. Such a just world order should not be based on the will of individual interest groups or national governments, but on global consensus, the "singularity" of the legal consciousness of all humanity, the rule of law and the high standards of a modern democratic state.

Global communication network technologies, referred to as "technologies of freedom", which generate a global public sphere and return us to a state of global public community, are capable of generating an unprecedented force that combines the will of thousands of generations, compressed at the point of "singularity" of our self-awareness, which will not only change the paradigm of society's development from division to unity, from competition to solidarity, but also create a new history, a new society and a new "Humanity the Creator".

The highest, superior level of global law, formed on the initiative of society itself as the absolute of human will and spirituality, accumulated by thousands of generations of ancestors and reflected in the basic principles of the world religions, will become the unquestionable expression of the ideal, the embodiment of the principle of the rule of law on a global scale.

At the same time, the sovereignty of states should not be questioned, which should naturally be linked to global sovereignty as private to general. It should be the embodiment

and the expression of global sovereignty in the governance of individual territories.

It must be said that the sovereignty of national authorities has never been absolute. In the conditions of the Middle Ages we observe a complex hierarchy of sovereignties of feudal society. Even the author of the concept of absolutism, Jean Bodin, initially excluded the spiritual principles and traditions established by the peoples (family) and the Church from the concept of absolute sovereignty (Bodin, 2000, p. 138).

"When Bodin used the adjective 'absolute' to define a sovereign, he did so as a Romanist, and as an historian of Roman law for whom the word absolutus was linked to legibus solutus — the prerogative of the one who is sovereign. One must pay close attention to Bodin's writing to understand his concept of 'absolute'. For Bodin a sovereign is 'not bound' (*absolutus*) by the civil or positive laws which he or his predecessors had promulgated. Nevertheless a sovereign is always bound to natural and divine law. Sovereignty, according to Bodin, is as supreme as one wishes, but is also limited by natural and divine law. The Kings of France were glorious because their sovereignty was limited by divine and natural law (cf. Methodus, 208-209). Unfortunately, with the introduction of the word 'absolutism' in the nineteenth century, historians of political philosophy began to consider Bodin as a theoretician of absolutism" (Turchetti).

The system of multiple levels of sovereignty is also present in federal states, and it was embodied in the creation of the European Union.

We should not underestimate the threat of the appropriation of the sovereignty of peoples by transnational

corporations and financial structures, its replacement by the ritual functions of bureaucracy (ritualisation of states). Through the appropriation of states by elites, the degradation of representative democracy, the corruption of officialdom and the creation of a pseudo-public sphere by propaganda broadcasting media, the sovereignty of states is increasingly being replaced by the "absolutism" of certain politicians or international groups of influence.

Thus, the natural and inevitable transit of sovereignty to the global level (global transit of sovereignty from the peoples to the global society) is the only and last chance of society for the power of the people in the conditions of globalisation.

Moreover, such a transit would create a new quality of the vertical separation of powers model, in which the highest legislative branch of power is formed at the global level, while national rule-making and administration remain at the level of the nation-states. This would provide guarantees for the independence of both branches of government. Since the general principles and provisions of global law would be universal, they could not be an instrument of appropriation by any particular national administration, and national governments would not be able to influence the opinion of the entire planetary civil community by forcing the population of the planet to legislate for their private benefit.

Such a model of centralised supreme law-making and decentralised regulatory and executive power excludes the creation of a global administration, a superstate, the seizure of which by interested groups could lead to the emergence of a dictatorship on a global scale, of the danger of such "the most terrible despotism", as the philosopher and

humanist I. Kant said in his works (Kant, 1965*b*, Vol. 4, p. 103).Thus, the institution of the state is the most important element of the expression of popular sovereignty and the basis for the full and independent development of peoples.

Attempts to see it as a "dying" institution in the context of globalisation and the related crisis of politics and the market economy lead to the need to centralise executive powers in the hands of supranational governance structures, often controlled by TNCs, and to the formation of a superstate on a planetary scale. This creates a real danger that the major players will ignore the interests of individual nations, solving their economic problems at the expense of less developed states, turning them into raw material appendages, into "third world" countries.

"As other organizations step into the shoes of the retreating state, they will no doubt seek to fill its role in many of these respects. Unlike the present members of the international community, all of which are sovereign, most of them will probably be unable to exercise exclusive control over a given territory; instead they will be forced to share that control with other organizations. Instead of being at least formally equal, as states are, some of them will no doubt be superior and others inferior. In other words, we are talking about a world whose legal structure will be more in harmony with political realities that already exist and which, in many ways and places, have never ceased to exist. The organizations which, in the future, will carry out the functions of government will be more fragmented, more integrated with each other than those with which we have become familiar during the last 300 years or so. Unlike states, which in theory at any rate are each other’s equals, they will also

tend to form hierarchical relationships with each other," predicts M. Creveld (Creveld, 1999, p. 418).

The main threat of this approach is the possibility of a global elite seizing power in such a superstate and establishing a global dictatorship backed by technologies designed to suppress and control society — technologies of digital slavery. Isn’t this what Immanuel Kant warned us about?

CHAPTER II.
CRISIS OF POLITICS. SOCIAL ORDER

Examining the historical origins of legal institutions, state institutions and the very existing social order, the theory of collective action suggests that interest groups are primarily responsible for the disregard of law and the growth of violence. These interest groups are the today's globalised elites, that have gradually taken over states, replacing law with legislative arbitrariness, the public sphere with a quasi-public sphere, history with myth, and spirituality with ideology.

At the political level, society often blames the appropriation of popular sovereignty on specific historical figures, such as politicians, leaders and chiefs, and explains it by their personal immorality, greed and aggression. In this construct, everything looks very simple. All that seems to be necessary is to remove the tyrants or corruptors from power and replace them with more decent people. But in practice, unfortunately, nothing changes. The place makes the man. Corrupt officials and corrupt representatives are inevitably replaced by the same, if not worse ones.

Obviously, in the social order itself lies the mechanism that allows the appropriation of sovereignty and the exploitation of society, what Aristotle already called "pleonexia" (Aristotle, 2011). This is expressed in the growing influence of the global oligarchic elites, financial-industrial groups and TNCs, allied with global crime, the deep state and international secret services, manipulating public opinion through the broadcast media they control, using media rituals, mediacracy and the pseudo-public sphere, bribing voters and turning elected representatives into lobbyists.

The global oligarchic power (Shestakov, 2012), armed with new technologies, concentrating significant financial resources, appropriating people's sovereignty, poses a direct and real threat in the form of an emerging global corporate superstate.

According to a major sociological study conducted by the University of Cambridge on public trust in various public institutions in 143 countries between 1958 and 2019, published in the British Journal of Political Science 2025, in most developed democracies "trust in parliament, government and political parties has been declining worldwide in recent decades". The survey results show that "trust in parliament is about 18 percentage points lower worldwide in 2019 than in 1990 (34.5 per cent compared to 52.5 per cent), and trust in government is about 13 percentage points lower" (Valgarðsson, Jennings, Stoker, Bunting, Devine, Klassen, McKay, 2025).

Against this background, however, trust in individual structures of executive power, their leaders, remains at the same level or even increases slightly.

The authors of the study speak of an obvious "crisis of confidence in political and democratic institutions" (Valgarðsson, Jennings, Stoker, Bunting, Devine, Klassen, McKay, 2025).

This can be explained by the steady drift of sovereignty away from popular representation in favour of global financial and economic structures, which are appropriating more and more of the regulatory powers of states in globalised spheres. The ritualistic and ineffective nature of the increasing number of laws adopted, which are incapable of having a real impact on globalised spheres, is becoming apparent to society. Representative bodies either lobby for

the interests of global players or show a clear inability to influence the situation with their decisions. In the eyes of society, all their legislative efforts increasingly resemble a "theatre of the absurd".

Against this background, the heads of the executive branch are perceived by the population as "tough guys" who either act as representatives of the new global sovereigns or are able to make "deals" with them in the public interest.

This creates a significant imbalance of power and a representative "vacuum" that can only be filled by institutions of direct democracy at the supranational level. So far, this imbalance has been offset by growing popular discontent and mass protests, which are increasingly merging into global network activism.

There are all the signs of a deep crisis of politics itself when "authority itself is thrown into the struggle for authority" (Lindblom, 1977, pp. 119-120). It is not surprising that in the absence of a genuine direct power of the people, of publicity, and of moral and spiritual foundations elevated to the status of supreme law, there is a fusion of politics and the economy of power through the transformation of economic power into political power. With the globalisation of finance and economy (markets), politics inevitably becomes an instrument of global oligarchic power.

Let us turn to the historical causes of such a crisis.

At the end of the first millennium AD, after the collapse of proto-states such as the barbarian empires and the spread of the spiritual principles of the great traditional religions, the ubiquitous agricultural and artisanal communities had to be united, globalised by transnational religious organisations. Throughout history, we observe a progressive process of the formation of a public sphere, a platform for discussion

united by common spiritual principles and values, religious languages, spiritual literature, and centres of communication in the form of cathedrals and congregations of believers. The principles of community life, such as openness, publicity and democracy, are reflected in the construction of supranational communities of believers.

Ancient empires as extended chiefdoms became a thing of the past. States in the modern Westphalian sense did not exist. There was a strong demand among peoples for international communication for the sake of understanding the spiritual principles of religion and common economic development, and trade.

The natural way of social development, as communication, foreign trade and connectivity grew, was to form a global socio-cultural space for communication and discussion, a supranational public sphere, a civil society in the form of a global community based on the social and spiritual principles of rational integration (spiritual socialism). This is the logic of the rational progressive development of society.

What has prevented this from happening in practice?

Under the influence of climate change, the nomadic peoples of Eurasia, who were unfamiliar with the agrarian way of life that had developed by that time in the Middle East and later in Europe, and with the rural agricultural communities, found themselves threatened with extinction due to the harsh climate changes. It should be noted that they were not familiar with the values of global religions and therefore, in such conditions, remained in a primitive state.

The way of life and economy exerted a significant influence on the formation of values and guidelines for the development of such societies.

For example, sedentary farmers and urban artisans in Europe and the Middle East lived and worked together, forming a natural association — the community. It was characterised by shared communication, direct popular democracy, open, trusting and public relations between members. These were the primary public spheres in which the principles of rational integration and mutual assistance emerged, when, in the words of A. Tarkovsky and S. Lem, "man needs man". This contributed to the development of principles and traditions of coexistence.

The steppe peoples of Eurasia led a nomadic lifestyle, in which the atomised personality of the head of the patriarchal family had virtually no need for the company of other people, acting as the owner of his wives and children, as well as his grazing herd. Relations between such atomised nomads were based exclusively on fierce competition for resources: water and territory. Such relations are identical to the evolutionary struggle for existence. This required maximum aggression and distrust of their fellow men.

In his works, the famous 20th-century anthropologist and philosopher Robert Ardrey repeatedly confirmed Konrad Lorenz's (Lorenz, 2002) thesis that biologically, "man is a territorial species, and that we defend our homes or our homelands for biological reasons, not because we choose but because we must" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 37).

In this logic, the seizure of resources and the destruction of the enemy as natural aggression and violent appropriation seemed natural and logical. Nomadic tribes and chiefdoms acted as natural temporary alliances for the joint seizure of resources and enslavement. They remained in paganism, as this was the state closest to the irrational competitive state of the biological animal.

Understanding the difference between these two lines of development is very important for interpreting the logic of the evolution of human society.

Wanting to save themselves, obeying their biological instincts, under the pressure of climatic changes they had to look for a favourable habitat in better natural conditions, considering it as a struggle for their survival. This centuries-long process was called the Great Migration.

Their aggressive onslaught on the more socialised communal peoples required the latter to organise violent defence. They needed military groups and regular troops.

The strongest, most aggressive, least empathetic individuals became the source of such military formations. Often they were criminals who had been expelled from their communities or clans for committing serious crimes (called "degenerates" by the Slavs). Such free troops, led by military leaders, were invited by communities to protect property and population from raids by nomadic barbarians.

Later, the practice of hiring barbarian tribesmen for these purposes spread. In addition, a significant part of the territory was simply under the yoke of barbarian tribes who created empires as sprawling chiefdoms for racketeering and violence. This process is well described by P. Kropotkin (Kropotkin, 2007, pp. 131, 137, 179), Ch. Tilly (Tilly, 1985, pp. 169-170) and P. Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 188).

The result of such events was the violent appropriation of the community's power and authority by mercenary military leaders who relied on violence and quickly converted military power and booty into political and economic state power.

P. Kropotkin described the process as follows: "Wild nature was conquered, roads were built through the forests and marshes, and the desert was populated by villages that had grown out of their parent communities. Markets, fortified towns and churches sprang up among the desert forests and plains. Gradually, the idea of wider alliances began to develop, encompassing whole tribes and groups of tribes of different origins. The old ideas of justice, which had been limited to revenge, were slowly and profoundly modified, and the idea of redress took the place of the idea of revenge. The common law, which is still the law of everyday life for two-thirds of mankind (at the end of the 19th century — author's note), if not more, gradually developed under this organisation, as did a system of customs which tended to prevent the oppression of the masses by a minority whose power grew as the opportunities for personal accumulation of wealth increased. This was the new form in which the desire of the masses for mutual support took shape. The economic, mental and moral progress achieved by humanity under this new popular form of organisation (the community — author's note) was so great that when states later began to form, they simply took over, in the interests of the minority, all the legal, economic and administrative functions which the village community had already exercised for the benefit of all" (Kropotkin, 2007, p. 124).

For a long time, the alternative to this development, alongside with the preservation of communal traditions, remained transnational religious structures and religious morality, law and justice derived from the spiritual traditions of the peoples. The new ruling military feudal elite made many efforts to eradicate this influence.

On the one hand, they created and imposed artificial identities in the form of nationalities; on the other hand, they undermined the influence of supranational ecclesiastical institutions in every possible way.

Society tried to reproduce natural communal and democratic forms of existence in the emerging free cities, which expelled military feudal rulers and built relationships with religious centres. P. Kropotkin writes: "Thousands of fortified centres were then built by the energies of the village communities; and, once they had built their walls, once a common interest had been created in this new sanctuary — the town walls — they soon understood that they could henceforward resist the encroachments of the inner enemies, the lords, as well as the invasions of foreigners. A new life of freedom began to develop within the fortified enclosures. The mediæval city was born. […] In Italy the young communes were continually sending away their defensors or domini, fighting those who refused to go. The same went on in the East. In Bohemia, rich and poor alike (*Bohemicae gentis magni et parvi, nobiles et ignobiles*) took part in the election; while, the vyeches (folkmotes) of the Russian cities regularly elected their dukes — always from the same Rurik family — covenanted with them, and sent the knyaz away if he had provoked discontent. At the same time in most cities of Western and Southern Europe, the tendency was to take for defensor a bishop whom the city had elected itself; and so many bishops took the lead in protecting the 'immunities' of the towns and in defending their liberties, that numbers of them were considered, after their death, as saints and special patrons of different cities" (Kropotkin, 2007, p. 134).

"Above all, medieval towns were often able to take advantage of the conflicts between the various monarchs,

princes, and noblemen to press for their own interests and even conduct their own foreign policy," Creveld notes (Creveld, 1999, p. 105).

However, through bribery, deception, and violence, the emerging elite managed not only to appropriate the functions of communal self-government, but also to bring religious organisations in their territory under their control (nationalise them), forcing religious leaders to recognise feudal rulers as representatives of God and the church. Gradually, this led to the formation of the absolutist Westphalian state in the mid-16th century.

The social principles of the new society became violence and legislative arbitrariness instead of law and tradition, competition for positions and resources instead of communal mutual aid, mutual distrust and fear instead of solidarity. As a result, the new small and organised elite, coming from barbarian societies or copying their methods, managed to impose their values and bonds on society through violence and deception, on the basis of the animal instinct of struggle for survival, which T. Hobbes formulated as "the struggle of all against all" (Hobbes, 2008).

The exclusion of religion and the replacement of universal spiritual principles and values with primitive fundamentalist and nationalist ideology, the common history of peoples — with the historical myth of the exploits of rulers and military leaders played a major role in this.

This process of collective degradation, a return to savagery, can safely be called a historical regression, and the social order formed by politics and markets can be called an evolutionary struggle for survival.

The competitive mode of agricultural and economic development, in the form of conspicuous consumption

and exploitation of the neighbour, was a consequence of the change from once integral communal social bonds to typical intraspecies competition.

Was there a real alternative to the triumph of barbarism, which P. Kropotkin called "military power" (military state) in his famous study *Mutual Aid: a Factor of Evolution* (Kropotkin, 2007, p. 98), following which Ch. Tilly considers these processes in such a paradigm (Tilly, 1985)?

The dominant form of social order in the Middle Ages was the community, which in many respects shared the characteristics and principles of organisation of the religious community, and rose to supranational spiritual unity. In parallel with territorial states, global supranational societies developed in the form of Christian religious orders (*orde religio* in Latin). Such associations were characteristic of the most educated part of medieval society — the clergy and the knights — who spoke the religious Latin language of supranational communication. They were based on the same communal principle, supplemented by the spiritual principles of solidarity and mutual acceptance (spiritual fraternity). At the same time, the Holy See of the Catholic Church was the global coordination centre for them.

Its strength, reach, power and influence were in many ways superior to the territorial-military feudal states that were then emerging. "The Church was the most important form of social organisation during that long period of history, which we call the Middle Ages. 'It was a reality, not just an idea; but it was also an idea — not just a reality', notes the British historian Ernest Barker" (quoted in Florovsky, 1998, p. 265).

We can say that religious orders functioned as a real, functioning alternative form of social organisation to emerging states.

Having reached their maximum development, religious (spiritual and knightly) orders faced two problems. Firstly, they were in complete opposition to the principle of biological competition of the territorial states that had been formed, and gave the most educated and wealthy individuals the opportunity to escape from the influence of power at the expense of globalisation on a religious basis. Secondly, their ideology, based on genuine spiritual principles, provided the thinking international community of intellectuals with a space for spiritual and philosophical quest and perfection, acting as a kind of soil for the living dialectical development of religious thought. Hence, their inevitable turn to spiritual quests and scientific research.

Following spiritual principles implied the value of the individual as a creation and did not correspond to the aims of the barbarian elite to oppress and enslave society as their bio-resource. The inevitable consequence of the appropriation and denationalisation of religion was its dogmatisation, ritualisation and the replacement of genuine spirituality with the ideology of fundamentalism. This explains the extreme cruelty and intolerance of the emerging states in exterminating possible competing alternatives, leading to the horrors of the Inquisition. And religious centres and associations themselves tended by force to transmit their spiritual power in favour of absolutist rulers, later with the help of mediarituals and bureaucratic rituals that turned the state itself, in Rousseau's words, into a "civil religion" (Rousseau, 1998).

The organisation of the *Orde Religio* (religious orders, Latin) also had physical constraints on its development. Since they were a phenomenon of supranational communication or public sphere in the form of a transnational community,

the lack of sufficient means of information exchange, of a large educated population speaking the languages of the religions as potential supporters, as well as a low degree of cultural and economic globalisation, the low mobility of the population and the property stratification of society prevented them from attracting a sufficient number of new participants ("neophytes") into their orbit. At the time, they remained club of the chosen ones and were unable to resist the aggression of widespread territorial elites.

Moreover, the position of the Holy See itself was a refusal to see them as the basis for a future global theocracy, and its concessions to the monarchs were soon "rewarded" by the states with a schism and secularisation of the Church.

As P. Bourdieu rightly observes, "their state-making enterprise presupposes the dissolution of the very order from which they emerged" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 76).

If, historically, religious orders appear to be a dead-end branch of the development of social order, then, against the background of the existential crisis of politics and territorial states in the era of socio-media globalisation, the revival of such principles appears to be quite a viable alternative to the world superstate of the world backstage.

Today, the practice of "investment passports" and dual citizenship is only the first step towards freedom of choice of association in the modern world united by socio-media globalisation, when a person can consciously overcome "civil slavery" and cease to be the a priori innate "property" of the elites who have appropriated states.

We see the emergence of virtual digital states that are not tied to a specific territory, such as Asgardia, a space state founded in 2016 by the scientist and entrepreneur Igor Ashurbeyli, which currently has more than 1.1 million

citizens around the world and, as the attractiveness of its citizenship grows, will be able to claim a global project.

Of course, the formation of territorial-military states cannot be attributed solely to the primitiveness and malice of barbarian military leaders. That would not be entirely fair. There were real economic conditions for their creation and triumph.

The agrarian type of economy, the underdevelopment of the scientific and technical spheres and, above all, the invasive, extensive type of colonial development required mass forced exploitation of people forced into routine labour. Most subjects and colonised peoples were forced to perform primitive labour that required neither creativity nor education. With the help of states, elites appropriated the labour of millions of "service people", and fundamentalist ideologies and collective rituals were used to maintain power over them, along with basic violence or the threat of violence.

Thus, social control had a primitive animal character, where the reward for appropriated labour was the satisfaction of primitive basic instincts for security, food and reproduction (protection of offspring). Mind control was exercised through ignorance and instinctive behaviour, incited by collective rituals and propaganda to resist the threat of the "alien pack". For this purpose, imposed national, political and ideological identities were invented, rightly called "imagined communities" by Benedict Anderson, when "with the ebbing of religious belief, the suffering which belief in part composed did not disappear. Disintegration of paradise: nothing makes fatality more arbitrary. Absurdity of salvation: nothing makes another style of continuity more necessary. What then was required

was a secular transformation of fatality into continuity, contingency into meaning. As we shall see, few things were (are) better suited to this end than an idea of nation" (Anderson, 1991, p. 35).

From here, we can trace the whole chain of social alternatives between religious orders and territorial states. These are: the basis of unification: solidarity or violence; the role of the individual: "man-creator" or "service"; spirituality: cognition (Gnosticism) or ritual dogmatism; the way of development: unification or conquest (colonisation); and finally, the main thing — the way of thinking: rational or irrational, instinctive (animal).

Thus, we can trace a peculiar departure of society, its degradation, from the rational path of development back to the animal irrational bioprogramme. In this case, "One of the effects of the state is to make people believe that there is no other path but the state," writes P. Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 137).

The same process corresponds to the change in the principles of economic development from communal solidarity and fair distribution to fierce competition and mutual exploitation, the struggle for resources and survival, which is the essential of animal capitalism. This in turn is an alternative to the social communal order of solidarity and mutual support. Where socialism is the rational and capitalism the irrational mode of economic connectivity of society.

The irrationality of violence and competition compared to the rationality of solidarity and mutual support is obvious even from the point of view of energy expenditure. The energy and time needed to unite and transform the environment in the common interest is wasted on irrational mutual oppression and containment. When, instead of common

good and progress, efforts are spent on confrontation and mutual destruction. This cannot be called rational. "It is the paradox of the social world that in certain ways it has quasi-biological, almost natural aspects: there are heaps of things that have a reason without having had this reason at their origin, which have a raison *d'etre*, a reason in the sense of a series of events, without rational calculation having been at their origin," says P. Bourdieu (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 140).

Even the major players in modern innovative business recognise the futility of such a strategy, saying that "competition is an ideology — the ideology that pervades our society and distorts our thinking. We preach competition, internalize its necessity, and enact its commandments; and as a result, we trap ourselves within it — even though the more we compete, the less we gain" (Thiel, Masters, 2014, p. 32).

Here is the conclusion about the rationality of altruism and the irrationality of egoism, in the confrontation of which we see the choice of social alternative on the whole path of development of our civilisation.

Sceptics may say that egoism and mutual competition for survival are the "driver" of the evolution of biological species.

Such an example is inappropriate. In the context of species evolution, the struggle for survival refers to interspecific competition, which the human species has successfully won by absorbing or destroying the last palaeoanthropes.

Moreover, the result of intraspecific competition between previously dominant species on the planet has always been extinction.

Robert Ardrey, quoting Charles Darwin, has written on the subject as follows: "There is truly nothing new about

extinction, excepting only the awareness. History, a great scientist once commented, is a charnel house of species. And perhaps the true uniqueness of man arises from his being the first tragic animal. We are the first, so far as we know, permitted self-estimate, permitted remembrance of things long past, permitted visions of things to come. We have been permitted pleasures transcending the joys of other animals, since we may savor ours in time's long contrasts. We have been granted, in full freedom, that exquisite perception revealing the moment that is now as the moment that has never been before. And will never come again. It is the final freedom that we are granted knowledge of the precipice, even as we have been allowed to construct it ourselves" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 40).

The quintessence of rational principles of co-existence and co-development are the spiritual principles and traditions developed by humanity over the last five thousand years of known history and reflected in the Holy Books of the world's religions, which give society and each individual the freedom to choose between rational (spiritual) and irrational (animal) principles.

Is this not, in a sense, the struggle between rational and irrational, good and evil, light and darkness, progress and degradation, life itself (development) and death (extinction)?

It should be said that the crisis of the modern social system, based on the "three pillars" of violence, egoism and competition, called politics, social status and the market, as an expression of biological irrational principles, is caused by the exhaustion of its potential for further development and the obviousness of its existential threat as a means of human extinction.

First, it is linked to the acceleration of scientific and technological progress, when the exponential development of technologies renders unnecessary and unprofitable the routine physical and even intellectual work of masses of people. Robotisation and the introduction of artificial intelligence have reduced the demand for this type of exploitation. In the post-industrial economy, such "service" people were simply unnecessary to the elite who had appropriated power and property.

Secondly, it is linked to the growth of socio-media globalisation, information connectivity and the formation of a common public sphere, a global civil society with unlimited access for everyone to any information.

These factors — scientific and technological progress and socio-media globalisation — coincide with the growth of education and literacy among the world's population, which is forced to master technological innovations.

Under these conditions, a global information community is being formed through network socio-media globalisation, which is capable of self-organisation and self-regulation on the basis of natural rational community principles and basic spiritual principles. The community needs rational integration to achieve peace, freedom and justice.

Fundamentalism and nationalism remain a refuge for the poorly integrated peoples of the "third world" in terms of social media and for states ruled by dictatorial regimes. Mass exploitation and the seizure of resources by force are relevant for underdeveloped peripheral economies. Thus, while in pre-state chiefdoms or absolutist states, conquered territories and resources automatically became the spoils and property of the ruler, in the civilised world,

the annexation of territories mostly entails only social and financial obligations to their populations.

At the civilisational core of globalisation, the role of the territorial state is changing, sovereignty is being transferred from nations to global society, transnational governance structures are being formed, and labour and capital markets are becoming globalised. A unified communicative and sociocultural space is being created with a common civic identity free from imposed templates.

But even here, the social order of nation states, politics and markets created over the last millennium remains an obstacle to the full rational and spiritual transformation of society.

The reason lies in the influence exerted by interest groups in the course of the privatisation of the bourgeois public sphere within the framework of the appropriation of popular sovereignty, who have gained control over globalised financial and industrial structures — transnational corporations, control over the media sphere through the creation of a quasi-public sphere and audience democracy, and who have turned parliamentarism into professional lobbying for private interests. Such global oligarchic power, combined with its appropriated ritual states, is interested in perpetuating global inequality through violence in order to appropriate resources and exploit entire regions of the planet.

APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM OF CHOOSING BETWEEN RATIONAL AND IRRATIONAL ALTERNATIVES (PHILOSOPHICAL DIGRESSION)

The desire to understand the ongoing processes forces us to consider the problem from different perspectives. It is impossible to analyse the genesis of leading social institutions in isolation from the study of society itself. Here, we have to take into account many aspects from a wide variety of fields of human knowledge. These include not only law, politics, economics, and sociology as sciences about society, but also biology and psychology as sciences about the individual.

The psychological aspect of the analysis of social change is not insignificant. And, in the deepest sense, the philosophical approach cannot be ignored. Without it, it is impossible to understand the true, deep roots of what is happening. And without such an understanding, there are no conclusions on how to overcome the crisis.

This chapter presents general thoughts about the nature of the changes taking place in society, and the deep driving forces of our consciousness or subconsciousness that are responsible for the future of our species.

It can be assumed that the key to understanding the social and spiritual processes of civilisational development is to understand the relationships between people in society.

Since sociality is the main characteristic of man, as a biological species and as a rational being, the nature of the individual and of society as a whole is determined by the social relations between people.

At the same time, these relationships can be correct and beneficial, or incorrect and destructive. Here, it is appropriate to recall the saying about spiritual wisdom, the understanding of which can be both life and poison.

The qualities of society and personality are acquired and revealed only in relations between people, in social interaction. When, in the words of spiritual teachings, God the Creator, or the power opposite to Him, is revealed between us.

The most appropriate analogy from the natural sciences is the two states of carbon, which can be either diamond or coal, depending on the bonds between its atoms. So, we can associate the right bonds with diamond, and the wrong bonds with coal.

This simile has a spiritual significance. The interaction of this substance, in its different states, with light, the flow of energy, is indicative. Light coming to a diamond passes through it, disperses, opens up, and illuminates the surrounding space. Light coming to carbon is absorbed by it. The stronger the flow of light energy, the more it will heat the coal, and eventually the coal will begin to burn, and will be burnt, despite the energy inherent in the bonds between the atoms, which are unsuitable for this purpose. In the diamond state, however, there's no danger of this happening. The necessary bonds in a diamond only help to transmit and reveal the power and beauty of light in its facets.

What if we understand the atom bonds of this substance as the bonds and relationships between people in society, and the light as the level of scientific and technological development and connectivity in the world (globalisation). That is the analogy.

But a diamond can become a brilliant after being cut. So, acquiring education, scientific, cultural and spiritual knowledge is similar to this "cutting" for society.

Thus, we can understand the doctrine of correcting the ills of society by changing the bonds in society, transforming them from wrong (irrational, competitive, biological) to right (rational, solidary), based not on the animal instinct of struggle for resources and survival, but on spiritual and rational principles of integration, developed by science and proposed by religions.

At the same time, the power of wrong bonds, such as mistrust or enmity, can always be transformed into a desire for solidarity and mutual assistance through rational reflection on the common benefits of joint endeavours.

A simple example can be the right bonds of people working together to build a dam for common irrigation, or the wrong ties of people fighting for access to a water source. Some bonds strengthen and develop societies and people, while others clearly destroy them.

This is what all the world's religions and spiritual teachings tell us.

From a scientific point of view, what is the nature of these social bonds?

The answer lies in the dual nature of man, who, on the one hand, is a biological species, a highly organised animal created by evolution and natural selection, and, on the other hand, has the distinct qualities of a rational social personality, capable of understanding nature, transforming the world around us by combining mental and physical forces in joint activities, analysing and improving his own personality and society as a whole.

This unique quality allows us to exist and think rationally, to perceive others and ourselves in the past, present and future as if outside ourselves, outside the current situation. It fundamentally distinguishes us from our animal ancestors, who lived by the irrational instinct of competition for resources and territory, in the present moment of their lives.

A French thinker, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, wrote in this regard: "The change in the biological state that led to the awakening of thought does not simply correspond to a critical point passed by an individual or even a species. Since this change is more far-reaching, it affects life itself in its organic integrity, and consequently it marks a transformation that affects the condition of the whole planet" (Teilhard de Chardin, 2008, p. 148).

The ability to think rationally gives rise in us to the desire for solidarity, mutual assistance, compassion for our neighbours (as a result of the development of empathy, which appeared in higher animals), building the future for future generations, up to sacrificing ourselves for the common future and good. In this case, we both think and exist on a new supra-personal level, combining in our consciousness the knowledge and aspirations of many generations of people, which could be called staying in the state of Noosphere — the principle of unity of all humanity as a law of nature (according to V. Vernadsky) (Vernadsky, 2013, p. 27), or the worldwide common soul.

The nature of such a common soul is always conscious, rational by virtue of the innate ability to think rationally, as well as informational and spiritual connectivity within the public sphere, is initially present in every human being as a desire for peace (solidarity), justice (publicity) and

freedom (creativity). These qualities are only revealed in the free, equal and public interaction of people in society. "Under the action of thought, the chains close and the Noosphere tends to become a closed system in which each element sees, feels, desires and suffers separately from and simultaneously with all the others. … A harmonised community of consciousnesses, equivalent to a kind of superconsciousness," describes P. Teilhard de Chardin (Teilhard de Chardin, 2008, p. 251).

One such model, developed over thousands of years of social existence, was the community of free and equal workers, who managed the common affairs through direct public democracy in assemblies (meetings). This form of existence can be observed in all peoples who have reached the sprouts of civilisation, when "we do not know one single human race or one single nation which has not had its period of village communities ... And even the English, when they first began to colonize America, used to return to the old system; they grouped into village communities," wrote P. Kropotkin (Kropotkin, 2007, pp. 103, 109).

We see the reflection of the principles of such a beneficial community in the ancient spiritual laws and traditions, which are surprisingly similar among all the peoples of the planet. This allows us to assert their natural origin. The most vivid expression of these principles are the biblical, Old and New Testament principles: love your neighbour as yourself, awe of the Creator and faith. More specifically, on a social level, these are the principles of equality, of accepting every human being as equal and as one's own; respect for nature and the environment, and above all, for the rights, freedoms and personality of the human being, as a creation of the Creator in His image, endowed with

His will and His qualities; and solidarity, trust in common values for the future common good of all civilisation.

From a spiritual point of view, the possession of these qualities makes the unified human being similar in qualities to God the Creator, and makes him a "Civilisation the Creator" through correct and universal connectivity.

When we speak of the wrong connectivity in society, it is necessary to admit that the dark, "animal", in Aristotle's words, side of the soul is also genetically present in man (Aristotle, 2011). This is an instinct for survival inherited from animal ancestors in the course of evolution. Since the interspecies struggle has been successfully won by the human race, the instinct is directed to the intraspecies struggle, with one's own kind, for resources, territory and the dispersal of offspring.

This animal selfish part of human nature ("the animal side of the soul", according to Aristotle) is inexorably present in everyone in the form of a natural biological programme. It has a deeply irrational character and is associated with a natural existential fear.

This bioprogramme is triggered in the absence of rational interaction based on rational or spiritual principles. It occurs through the regression of the personality, its return to the animal state, in the form of the awakening of the deep archetypes of fear, aggression and competition, distrust of the "other". K. Lorenz and R. Ardrey say that "aggressiveness and consequent competition are innate propensities in the human as well as other species" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 209; Lorenz, 2002, p. 47).

However, these researchers pointed out that animal aggression, armed with some rationality at the instrumental level in humans, gives rise to a profoundly irrational cruelty

leading to total irrational mutual extermination, something we do not find in other animal nature. They spoke of competition having limits — the rules or values of society, what Rousseau called the "social contract", beyond which there must be no threat to survival. "The problem of man is not that we are aggressive but that we break the rules," says R. Ardrey, following K. Lorenz and his world-famous study *On Aggression* (Ardrey, 1970, p. 273; Lorenz, 2002, p. 47).

It is surprising how these characteristics of human cruelty, such as the perception of the other as a threat, as an "alien", the priority of personal egoistic needs over the common future and goals, the hostile exploitative attitude towards nature and neighbours, the neglect of the common good and the future for the sake of immediate personal egoistic gain, are the opposite of the highest spiritual principles of the world religions.

It is obvious that following such a bioprogramme does not bode well for society. Barbaric plundering of resources and exploitation of the environment, against the backdrop of growing consumption demands, will inevitably lead to depletion of resources and destruction of our environment. The inability to consolidate, learn together, and transform the environment will not allow us to meet these challenges.

Furthermore, under conditions of scarcity of resources and reduction of available habitat, society will inevitably set in motion the mechanism of struggle for survival. Aggressive mutual destruction in the intraspecific struggle for habitat and resources will lead to the reduction of the human species and will not allow for an adequate response in solidarity to existential challenges and threats. The outcome of such a path will inevitably be the fate of all previously dominant species on the planet — extinction.

Yes, all previously dominant biological species on the planet have become extinct.

A prominent biologist and physiologist, Nobel Prize winner Konrad Lorenz, directly states that "With humanity in its present cultural and technological situation, we have good reason to consider intra-specific aggression the greatest of all dangers ... looking upon man as he is today, in his hand the atom bomb, the product of his intelligence, in his heart the aggression drive inherited from his anthropoid ancestors, which this same intelligence cannot control, would not prophesy long life for the species" (Lorenz, 2002, pp. 26, 46).

Surprisingly, is this not why in religious eschatology, which follows animal instincts, the worship of the inner "beast" is called the way of destruction? Just as the devil himself is called the "beast" and the "son of perdition". Is this not what biblical wisdom is trying to warn us against? And aren't these the threats and challenges we see facing civilisation today?

Can a society that is unjustly and increasingly bound by universal competition and mutual distrust of the existing social order in the form of politics and markets continue to exist, as globalisation progresses?

It would seem that the existence of wrong bonds would simply determine the character of the society of the future as savage and unjust. This is how it is often portrayed to us by science fiction writers and pessimistic futurologists.

I am prepared to disappoint them. It is obvious that maintaining incorrect connectivity in society would be possible under three conditions: a small population, a low degree of globalisation (connectivity), and low technical armament. In this case, a global war of all against all,

affecting the whole world and threatening the entire human race and the planet itself, would not be possible. Also, in the case of the small population of the past, the level of impact from barbaric exploitation and conflicts on the environment was low due to the small number of consumers and combatants, the underdevelopment of industry, and the absence of weapons of mass destruction. Could the rare battles of ancient horse and foot soldiers really threaten the planet and humanity?

In modern conditions, the persistence of wrong connectivity is an existential threat to humanity and the entire Earth's biosphere.

We can assume that the mechanism of mutual destruction is similar to destructive autoimmune reactions in the organism, when in each person there is initially hatred and aversion to the animal egoistic aggression that we see and try to eradicate in others, unfortunately without realising its presence in ourselves. However, the root of this irrational aggression and selfishness is also in ourselves, as a manifestation of our animal (biological) origins. The realisation of this fact and the transformation of the struggle within the species into a spiritual inner work of rationalisation of one's own behaviour, the success of which is only possible through a general rational unification of the efforts of the whole of society in mutual assistance and cooperation for the common good and the future, is the only way to worldwide salvation and healing from this inborn disease.

It can be assumed that only the civilisation that chooses the path of rational integration and mutual assistance as a true factor of evolution can become a highly developed civilisation of interplanetary scale. Otherwise, the natural

filter of degradation, aggression and self-destruction will lead it to inevitable extinction within its home planet.

Thus, the alternative is this: humanity can have cosmic prospects as a Civilisation the Creator or continue to follow the path to its extinction. This is the natural dilemma that needs to be understood. The choice is ours.

CHAPTER III.
SOCIETY, LAW:
VIOLENCE AND INEQUALITY

In foreign policy, we observe the transformation of individual irrational egoism into national or state egoism, and ultimately into civilisation-wide super-egoism and super-aggression. In this case, the geopolitical blocs that are being formed, guided by irrational principles, perceive other societies as a source of resources, an object for exploitation, or an existential threat. Considering the total technological capabilities of such associations, the threat to humanity is magnified many times over.

Interest groups promote the principles of collective struggle and competition as the basis of international relations using the quasi-public sphere and collective media rituals, using the same irrational principles in human and social consciousness, turning peoples into opposing "animal packs".

The ideas of a collective return to a pre-cultural state or savagery at the level of society and the state in the form of the emergence of totalitarian political regimes were developed in the works of the well-known criminologist Ju. Antonjan. His concept is based on Carl Jung's theory of archetypes in the collective unconscious (Jung, 1997) and the views of K. Popper and S. Moscovici on the degradation of personality in totalitarian societies.

In international law, the term "criminal state" has been used actively in recent decades. Indeed, the most serious crimes of the last century were committed by totalitarian political regimes that had seized control of state mechanisms. However, the state, when considered as an instrument of

legal violence and coercion, cannot be the source of intent to commit criminal acts.

Examining cases of "state criminality" (Antonjan, 2015*b*) more closely reveals that criminal political regimes that appropriated the sovereignty of peoples and states were the actors and subjects of criminal acts and intentions. Furthermore, the realisation of criminal intentions in such cases was often left to political punitive bodies that substituted state structures.

Therefore, it is more accurate to speak of criminal political regimes and the failed states they have taken over. Perhaps the most accurate term in this case would be "political criminality".

When discussing the criminality of political regimes, Ju. Antonjan observes that "the totalitarian regime, in its most brutal forms, represents a return to distant ... times when life was based entirely on brute force and reprisals (or the threat thereof)" (Antonjan, 2003, p. 169). This approach to political competition made total terror and the destruction of anyone deemed undesirable by the authorities possible, including social groups or entire nations.

According to Ju. Antonjan, in totalitarian and dictatorial regimes, power does not depend on the will of the people. He sees this as a fact of "denial of civilisation". He recognises that popular approval of a policy of "state terrorism" appropriates power exclusively to the political leadership due to the "atmosphere of general horror" achieved through bloody ritual violence and human "sacrifice" in the form of public massacres, repression and executions (Antonjan, 2003, p. 175). Under these conditions, society is forcibly imposed the idea of rejecting civilisation and its humanistic

ideals, and returning to a "primitive way of life and way of thinking" (Antonjan, 2003, p. 177).

In the words of R. Ardrey, "We tamper with the individual at utmost peril, for it is he, not the mob, who can learn. It is he, the post-neocortical inhabitant of our skulls, who possesses the foresight to make alliances when alliances are to his interest, to make compromises when compromises offer practical advantage, to inhibit the violent action when violence in the end will only destroy him — who, though tempted to assault society, will still ask how he will survive without it. The reptilian mob possesses no such capacity. The individual may and must grapple with the animal within him. As Anthony Storr has written, 'Although we may recoil in horror when we read in newspaper or history book of the atrocities committed by man upon man, we know in our hearts that each one of us harbors within him those same savage impulses which lead to murder, to torture and war.' The individual with his post-neocortical self-awareness can know it, accept it, guard against it. The reptilian mob cannot" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 373).

The actual barbarisation of society is evident in the rejection of rational thinking and the return to primitive archetypes of the collective unconscious, as described by C. Jung.

According to C. Jung, these collective archetypal representations are rooted in basic animal instincts that the human race has inherited from its primate ancestors throughout evolution. Each archetype is a similar subconscious representation for all people and is a complex of standard instinctive reactions to strong external stimuli, manifested at an unconscious, irrational, intuitive level. "The collective unconscious consists of the sum of instincts

and their correlates — the archetypes. As well as instincts, every individual possesses a stock of archetypal images... Taken together, instincts and archetypes form the 'collective unconscious'", as described by C. Jung in his work "Instinct and the Unconscious" (Jung, 1997, pp. 57-68).

To follow the call of the collective irrational unconscious would be to return to the state of a pack of primates rather than to the ancient, wild way of primitive people. Analogies with primitive man are only acceptable here because his level of evolution was not yet far removed from that of his animal ancestors. With only the rudiments of reason and remaining dependent on the forces of nature, primitive man survived in evolutionary struggle, guided mainly by the biological programme of animals.

The essential question is: what is the mechanism by which collective consciousness returns to a state akin to that of a wild animal?

We could argue that politics, as a social institution initially based on animalistic egoism and the legalisation of violence, uses the power of the state to implement a mechanism of social degradation, or barbarisation. Politics and the state give an irrational minority the opportunity to realise their base, egoistic and destructive tendencies through violence and exploitation on a "legal" basis, channelling the irrational aggression of the masses against political enemies or other peoples. All cruel executioners, murderers and sadists from totalitarian regimes of the last-century Europe hardly would have dared to become criminals if they had not been given this dubious "gift" of doing it legally, under the state's shelter.

This happens to a greater or lesser extent in any state that, in rejecting publicity and democracy, tends towards

totalitarian control of society and the endless expansion of its power at the expense of other peoples and territories. Remember the tragedy of D. Floyd in the USA, for example. This occurs to a lesser extent where politics and its physical embodiment, the state, are constrained by natural limitations such as spirituality, genuine law and full people's power (direct democracy and communal publicity).

Mass social degradation, characterised by the rejection of rational thinking and integration in favour of primitive, instinctive patterns of behaviour (archetypes), is always a reaction to the complex challenges and existential threats of a given time.

Thus, we know of many examples of such savagery during epidemics, famines or natural disasters, when parts of society seek salvation through violence or the destruction of their own kind. Existential terror and the panic it generates most often awaken the "inner beast".

The emergence of any totalitarian regimes has similar features. In this case, a degraded minority that has taken control of the state uses legalised violence and propaganda to create fear and panic, suppress society and make public consciousness more primitive, while also bureaucratising the functions of the state.

This process can be expressed in the words of the Soviet physiologist I. Pavlov: "It is easy for a man descended from a beast to fall" (Pavlov, 1934-1935).

Thus, the collective unconscious, in the form of the social reflection of biological instincts — the "animal" part of the soul, according to Aristotle; the "shadow", according to C. Jung; or the "animal" beginning — is initially present in both the individual and society. In normal social conditions, this aspect is replaced and suppressed by rational thinking

and moral and spiritual tradition, expressed in ethics, morality and law as spirituality, referred to in spiritual literature as "Light".

Natural rationality, the desire for integration, peace, freedom, equality and justice are also inherent in humans; they are revealed through free, equal and public interaction in society, and they have a universally human character.

Consequently, when we exclude the artificial identities imposed by politicians, we see humanity as a carrier of unified irrational archetypes and spiritual values, expressing the dual irrational (biological) and rational (spiritual) nature of the individual and society. Both the irrational and the rational beginnings are present in each of us, giving us the freedom to choose consciously between them when performing actions.

The conditions for the degradation (barbarisation) of public consciousness are the destruction of genuine spirituality by ideology (the state as Rousseau's "civil religion"), the substitution of the power (supremacy) of law by the right of power (arbitrary legality), the rupture of communicative space (isolationism), the substitution of rational thinking by dogma (fundamentalism), the substitution of history by historical myth, and the substitution of the public sphere by the pseudo-public broadcast media.

The smaller the role of legalised state violence and official propaganda in the life of society, the less chance for its return (barbarisation). The only way to overcome this permanent threat is to minimise the violent functions of states by subordinating them to a global spiritual law as the true expression of the rule of law at the global level.

With a universal toolkit in the form of the theory of connections and choices between rational and irrational thinking, we can analyse any social processes in this way.

The crisis in international politics is clearly evident in attempts to create military-political blocs of states, to extend the sovereignty of certain key players to the global level by force, in the desire to give national law a global character through threats of force, and to justify, legally and ideologically, the preservation of inequality between "first", "second" and "third world" countries.

Against this backdrop, fundamentalist regimes in some developing states are attempting to consolidate their power by promoting nationalism and isolationism, yet they remain vulnerable to the global oligarchic system.

With the complete development of the planet's territories, the possibility of colonisation through territorial appropriation has been exhausted. Moreover, with the decline of national governments' influence on the economy in favour of transnational corporations, armed territorial disputes are becoming a thing of the past, as governments, unlike their medieval predecessors — absolute monarchs — are not interested beneficiaries-acquirers of conquered territories. Apart from increased social obligations and additional expenses, territorial appropriations bring them nothing. Soft power in the form of control over the economy and finances has become the privilege of business, of TNCs, which do not need to formally appropriate certain territories for this purpose. Thus, in recent decades, we have seen conflicts over territory mainly between developing countries on the global periphery, where states that emerged from former colonies have degenerated into chiefdoms, with power and property concentrated in the hands of the elites.

Clearly, the global crisis of the 21st century politics is nothing but a new wave of irrationalism on a collective level.

From the perspective of our "theory of connections", we conclude that the organisation of any social system based on the irrational principles of violence and appropriation (i.e. irrational connections) expressed through politics and markets prevents society from developing fully, leading to its disintegration and self-destruction.

By contrast, an example of a system with rational connections is a living organism, where the connections between its elements (organs and systems) are aimed at the existence and development of an integrative systemic whole. These "correct" connections can be described as rational, solidary and integrative. Ultimately, they embody life, while "irrational", disintegrative, competitive connections embody the death of the organism and its transformation into decaying matter. It transpires that the secret of life and death largely lies in the organisation of connections.

Similar processes occur in any social organism, human society.

During the second millennium AD, the degradation and irrationalisation of social connections, alongside the destruction of the natural form of human society — the community — and the transition to irrational principles of social organisation, such as a legal apparatus of violence, political power and a market economy, created an existential threat to humanity.

As technological progress accelerates, our ability to influence the environment increases (through the total extraction of natural resources and pollution of habitats), as does the strengthening of global connectivity and interdependence between peoples. The power of "correct" or "incorrect" connectivity is therefore

growing exponentially, accelerating either progress and development or regression (degradation) and the demise of humanity as a species.

It's not just about scientific or technical progress creating the tools to implement one scenario or another. Although this also has a significant impact. Just imagine what we could achieve if we directed the resources spent on creating weapons of mutual deterrence and destruction towards the genuine common good of civilisation and development.

Once again, our metaphorical comparison of the difference in atomic bonds between a diamond and coal is appropriate here. A diamond is capable of absorbing and reflecting an infinite amount of light energy, whereas coal has a limit to its absorption; once this limit is reached, it begins to burn and disintegrate. Similarly, a society based on "incorrect", irrational (animalistic) bonds has no future in an era of high energy and technology. This is why the devil is compared to the "son of perdition" and the "beast" (animal bioprogramme, irrational connections), while God is compared to "life" and "the way" (the future). When the Saviour says, "I am the way, the truth, and the life" (New Testament, John 14:6), these coincidences cannot be accidental.

Irrational connections at the collective, international level are particularly dangerous when collective, archetypal fear of the "other" perceives another "imaginary community", another people, as a threat to its own existence. As C. Lindblom aptly put it in his work *Politics and Markets* the essence of modern politics, as "authority itself is thrown into the struggle for authority" (Lindblom, 1977, pp. 119-120), lies precisely in the control of society through archetypal instincts aroused by collective rituals, including

media rituals, bureaucracy, and ritual violence (repression), with the aim of exploitation and illegal appropriation ("pleonexia"). By appealing to collective archetypes and imposed identities, the necessity of the political apparatus appropriated by elites is substantiated.

The destructive power of the collective herd instinct — an animal archetype armed with scientific and technological progress — in eliminating the threat of the "other" cannot be underestimated. The very concept of the "other", the idea that someone can be "alien" or "different", contradicts the fundamental spiritual principle of religion: love for one's neighbour.

A breakdown in communication within society is always a prerequisite for the activation of the "other" archetype. R. Ardry notes that "the prime foundation for the future of civil violence must be the invention of strangers. And the prime ingredient for the invention of strangers must be non-communication between those who speak the same language" (Ardry, 1970, p. 295). "I have already said that we can learn much from demagogues who pursue the opposite purpose, namely to make peoples fight. They know very well that personal acquaintance, indeed every kind of brotherly feeling for the people to be attacked, constitutes a strong obstacle to aggression. Every militant ideology in history has propagated the belief that the members of the other party are not quite human… If mere acquaintance has this remarkable and altogether desirable effect, it is not surprising that real friendship between individuals of different nationality or ideology are even more beneficial. No one is able to hate, wholeheartedly, a nation amongst whose numbers he has several friends," says K. Lorenz about the manipulative nature of politicians and the saving

power of people's diplomacy (socio-media globalisation) (Lorenz, 2002, pp. 273-274).

The contemporary philosophy and religious ethics of love for one's neighbour and tolerance towards the "other" or "alien" affirm the need for their involvement in the public sphere (according to J. Habermas) and stem from the denial of the instinctive animal principle, making our social ties rational (Habermas, 1998). Religion, on the other hand, speaks of the absolute mutual acceptance of any person as oneself. Instead of "alien" or "other", there is only "neighbour" — someone who is the same as me and equal to me. This spiritual construct emphasises the global unity of humanity in a single spiritual community, where all imposed identities are lost and there is "neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcised or uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave or free," in the words of the Apostle Paul (New Testament, Colossians 3:11).

The millennia of efforts by spiritual teachers and religion must be acknowledged as not having been in vain, as the Old Testament principle of mutual acceptance and assistance within national and state communities still exists to some extent today. However, irrational and archetypal elements have found expression in relations between peoples and states. We observe manifestations of animal competition in the form of nationalism, which is based on imposed imaginary identities.

Hence the phenomenon of the "respectable" citizen, who is kind and sensitive to his fellow tribesmen but, at the behest of politicians and the state, is capable of mass destruction of people in wars with other nations. This animal irrationality is the result of an incorrect connection between peoples, leading to mutual destruction and the potential elimination of life on the planet.

The only way to correct this is to convince everyone to change the bonds between people to ones based on spiritual and rational principles. This means debunking imposed identities and imaginary communities and realising that people need each other.

How can this process be accelerated? It is possible that an encounter with extraterrestrial life forms could push the ancient archetype towards uniting the human race against another "alien" life form. But if this confrontation is aggressive, will it benefit humanity? Is this why we still have no contact with more evolved civilisations? Perhaps an understanding of such prospects is what prevents them from communicating with us. Assuming the existence of communication between intelligent life in the universe, the only way to organise such interactions rationally is to assume the triumph of the universal law of loving one's neighbour, which will be accepted by all in the perspective of everyone, known to us from the Holy Books as a spiritual principle, perhaps even a "universal constitution". The very alternative for the development of any civilisation, including ours, lies either in accepting higher spiritual principles and rejecting animal irrational tendencies, or in inevitable extinction at the planetary development stage. Are the spiritual principles of the earthly Holy Teachings not taken from the provisions of a certain "universal constitution"? There is much to ponder...

Thus, at a certain stage of development, humanity found itself hostage to its own syndrome of collective regression to the biological programme (barbarisation), animal principles of mutual distrust and struggle for survival, leading us to the end of life of the dominant species on the planet — extinction.

This process of social "regression" is an inevitable consequence of rejecting spiritual work to build "correct" social relationships based on higher spiritual principles and traditions, and indulging our animal nature — the dark side of the soul — which is inherently present in us.

During the Middle Ages, civilisation succumbed to the archetype of the "other" during existential challenges relating to climate, biology and politics. This brought the most aggressive elites to power, who seized control of society for a long period and embodied the principles of the animal struggle for existence within the social order. Their driving force was violence aimed at achieving and maintaining inequality a principle that is completely contrary to the spiritual principle of loving one’s neighbour.

CHAPTER IV.
LAW, SOCIAL ORDER AND GLOBAL SOCIETY

At the dawn of human civilisation, spiritual traditions, as expressed through religious thoughts, served as the foundation of law. For hundreds of thousands of years, society existed and was developing on the basis of spiritual tradition. These were the norms of coexistence that had been painstakingly developed by generations of our ancestors, sanctified by their faith, and universally accepted by all in the perspective of everyone. It was their spirit and meaning that the principles of our coexistence and harmonious development were born from. These syncretic norms of traditional law, fused with culture and tradition, were at the forefront of any society. Spiritual tradition was proclaimed to be God's Law, above all other laws. "In 1302 Pope Boniface VIII issued his famous *Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam*. Quoting Jeremiah — 'I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms' (Jeremiah 1:10) — the Bull proclaimed that secular power should be exercised *ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*, 'at the command and sufferance of the priest'" (Creveld, 1999, p. 61).

Secular power, also known as sovereign power, emerged within the Westphalian system as a result of the transition of sovereignty from religious authorities to secular rulers. Each of these rulers based their right to power on the recognition and approval by religious organisations. In Europe, the transfer of power (sovereignty) from the head of the church to the rulers of medieval states was the first stage in this transition.

At the same time, religious law and justice represented the highest level of supranational law and justice, marking the first global constitution and constitutional justice in human history. Similar processes took place in Islamic societies, which were united by a common spirituality and the Arabic language.

Under these conditions, there was no need for peoples to adopt constitutions, as traditional and religious law fulfilled their role successfully. These laws enjoyed universal recognition, universality and extreme stability of norms. These laws were based on the natural human desire for freedom, peace and justice.

During the subsequent period civilisation was destined to go through the processes of appropriation of the state and the right to legislate by interested groups, the emerging aristocratic elite.

The spiritual principles and traditions of the church stood in the way of their desire for the complete subjugation and enslavement of society and a return to the violent rule of pagan empires. This resulted in the secularisation of society and the state, and ultimately the nationalisation of the church itself, transforming it into a state institution and political instrument.

A similar fate befell law as a social institution.

Trampled by the elites by right of force, spiritual law degenerated into positivist law — the formalised will of the sovereign ruler — during the period of absolutism. Absolute monarchs who had appropriated the state could confidently claim to be both the state and the law in a single person: "*L'État, c'est moi*" ("I am the state", in French).

By the end of the Middle Ages, several spiritual civilisations based on the same principles had emerged

around the world. Based on the logic of civilisational progress, one could expect the formation of a single communicative and public space as information, economic and cultural interaction between them grew.

In these conditions, the feudal states formed were conditional administrative-territorial units that were formally included in religious interstate associations and global spiritual civilisations with a single religious centre and spiritual constitutional principles.

However, the subsequent thousand-year course of development can be explained by the theory of social regression.

Processes of global integration were replaced by processes of social degradation.

The resulting surplus production and the need to defend against raids by nomadic barbarian peoples enabled the formation of class elites and the creation of a state apparatus of violence. Acting purely in their own interests, an active minority appropriated states. This was expressed through the replacement of popular representation with class representation, the division of the communal public sphere into classes, the removal of religious institutions from societal management and their violent transformation into state institutions, and the imposition of artificial national, confessional and political identities, the replacement of religious and traditional law with legislation (the principle of positivism), the replacement of religious traditions with mass political and bureaucratic rituals (with media rituals later), and the organised minority in power's reliance on systematic ritual violence, presented to the society as legal.

This was undoubtedly an innovation, even in relation to ancient empires. The language used by ancient historians

clearly shows that the Greeks and Romans never perceived the state as an abstract entity separate from its citizens. "Where we could say 'the state', they would write 'the public' or 'the people'; after all, it was the historian Thucydides who wrote that 'the city is its men' and the lawyer Cicero who defined the respublica (*res publica*) as 'an assembly of men living according to law'" (Creveld, 1999, p. 57).

By the middle of the 17th century, most parts of the world, including Europe, had formed absolutist states, which were appropriated by an organised minority and served only as a means of enslaving peoples and appropriating their property. This collective atomisation of humanity was a social regression and a return to the realisation of the biological programme of animals in the form of collective (herd) egoism. Such regression inevitably led to an increase in intra-species competition, in the form of a war of all against all (Hobbes, 2008), the enslavement and destruction of one's own kind during colonisation, and the barbaric and predatory exploitation of nature.

However, since the natural desire for peace, freedom and justice is part of human nature, absolutism was ultimately rejected by the people. Global connections then arose and grew in power alongside the development of trade, communications and, most importantly, the development of information exchange through the emergence of printed materials.

Over the course of three centuries, popular revolutions overthrew absolutism, adopting the slogans of freedom (tolerance), equality (justice) and brotherhood (peace).

It is not hard to understand why the outright arbitrariness of sovereign monarchs served as a catalyst for the numerous revolutions that overthrew absolutism and restored

sovereignty to the people, whose will was expressed in adopted constitutions. At the heart of the surprisingly similar vision of the future shared by all peoples and expressed in the constitutions of most states were the familiar spiritual principles of freedom (tolerance), justice (equality) and peace (brotherhood).

As globalisation developed, the colonial system formed by absolutism inevitably collapsed due to the conquered peoples' natural desire for peace, freedom and justice, as well as for preserving their traditional habitat and environment.

A change of government and the overthrow of the aristocracy presented a unique opportunity to incorporate spiritual principles into law and restore the role of religious organisations in society. However, without a return to the traditions of communal democracy and spiritual foundations, this did not happen.

The bourgeois public sphere, formed by emerging mass media and popular sovereignty, was appropriated by the new financial and industrial elite through replacing the public sphere with broadcast media under their control, as well as through the bribery of officials and the financing of parliamentary election campaigns.

Without spiritual tradition to back it up, the law, as an expression of popular sovereignty, along with democratic states, was soon successfully appropriated by the new financial and economic elites and the lobbyists and bureaucrats serving their interests. This was made possible by the privatisation of the bourgeois public sphere, the ritualisation and mediatisation of politics by broadcast media, and the formation of a quasi-public sphere and mediacracy.

This was greatly facilitated by "popular absolutism", the interpretation of popular sovereignty as the absolute

will of the majority, unbound by higher principles, values, or spiritual tradition. As the renowned legal scholar Carl Schmitt explained, when the will of the people is elevated to absolute status, it becomes popular absolutism (Schmitt, 2000, pp. 44-45). In reality, however, it degenerated into the absolutism of politicians ("absolutät") who appropriated popular representation. The legislative arbitrariness of monarchs became the absolute arbitrariness of the political elite and financial and industrial groups that appropriated the state and the law. Most worryingly of all, society did not fundamentally resolve the question of the values that define law. This paved the way for Carl Schmitt's neo-absolutist doctrine of "decisionism" to infiltrate the concept of popular sovereignty. In this construct, the unbound and unrestricted will of the people ended up in the hands of a parliamentary minority of lobbyists.

At the beginning of the 20th century, this allowed totalitarian regimes, free from spiritual principles, moral and legal restrictions, to emerge in society.

What were the roots of this tragic period in our civilisation's history? The answer is obvious. It lies in the spiritual emptiness of those in power and the absence of law as an expression of spirituality and tradition.

The manifestation of monstrous collective aggression between peoples and states in the 20th century took civilised humanity by surprise. Historians, philosophers, psychologists and legal scholars asked themselves: how did civilised man, heir to thousands of years of spirituality and culture and the values of humanism and popular sovereignty, manage to degenerate so quickly, return to a savage state and reach the point of mass extermination of entire races and peoples? Most philosophical and religious doctrines of the past were

based on the idea that the moral and spiritual education of individuals was necessary for the transformation of society as a whole from a savage state into a harmonious organism. Was the work of philosophers, priests, writers, artists and teachers over the centuries completely in vain?

I think the answer is obvious. The answer lies in the fundamental difference between individual and societal behaviour. Any society is a system that possesses the characteristic of emergence, acquiring completely new and different characteristics compared to a simple mass of individuals. Society becomes an organism with its own unique properties.

I would call this the paradox of the "good boy" who is ready to become a "respectable" citizen. For example, a young man who was raised with humanism, love and compassion and who recently cried sincerely over the death of a pet hamster may, as part of a social organism (community), carry out an order to use weapons against "other" people belonging to "other" communities without any hesitation. Moreover, such an act would not necessarily manifest personal selfishness. People are capable of committing such acts for the greater good, in the name of their nation, religion, politics or the state, even sacrificing their own lives or those of their loved ones. This is difficult to explain in terms of animal selfishness or self-preservation. You also can't say that all the people who took part in the terrible crimes against humanity committed by totalitarian political regimes in the past, such as the Holocaust, were unhealthy and destructive individuals with warped minds.

Consequently, the destructive and aggressive behaviour of such a "good boy" cannot be considered rational or irrational on a personal level.

Perhaps, in this case, we are talking about the complete suppression of an individual's personality by society's leaders through propaganda, violence, or the threat of violence, thereby imposing organised groups' will on individuals.

This is entirely possible, but it presupposes that the person regrets and repents for what they have done, provided that the pressure and threats cease.

Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Rather, we are talking about the merging of an individual with the community being formed, when he voluntarily (or volunt-compulsorily) loses his personal moral qualities and becomes merely an instrument of a qualitatively new system, acquiring its properties.

Here we can observe the revival of the biological programme that returns the society (the public sphere) to the state of a primitive animal herd: a syndrome of collective savagery and a return to barbarism or decivilisation. This can cause a group of kind, well-educated, civilised people to become an animalistic herd of "their own kind", fighting for survival against "aliens". Within the framework of such collective egoism, the darkest archetypes of the animal world are revealed, such as the seizure of territories and the physical extermination of "aliens" and their offspring. Carl Jung's theory of collective archetypes and the conclusions of modern criminologists explain this phenomenon (Antonjan, 2015*a*).

The fragile world order established after World War II was based on the balance of interests of the major victorious powers and on international law and mutual agreements between these powers. The establishment of the United Nations attempted to found a new world order

on the rights and freedoms of the individual, recognised by the majority of states. The basis of such international humanitarian law was the formal recognition and approval of its norms by the parliaments and governments of most states.

However, as Nobel Prize-winning legal scholar F. Hayek noted, no effective mechanism was created to enforce such norms. Without this, they remained a "gentlemen's agreement" between the leading powers. As Hayek said, "Our attempts to create an international government capable of assuring peace have generally approached the task from the wrong end: creating large numbers of specialized authorities aiming at particular regulations rather than aiming at a true international law which would limit the powers of national governments to harm each other" (Hayek, 1998, p. 149).

By the beginning of the 21st century, the collapse of the colonial system, the shift in the balance of power between the leading powers and the subjugation of many developing states to the will of the emerging global oligarchic power had resulted in the degradation of unstable states. This gave rise to the question of law as the basis of the world order with renewed vigour.

The politics of the new multipolar world once again became dominated by power and economic containment, taking on a confrontational character. In these conditions, the leading players in world politics and the global economy developed a desire to extend their sovereignty to other societies and states, viewing law as an expression of their own will backed by military force and economic power.

International broadcast media, controlled by the financial elite, create a clone of the public sphere in the information

space, within which the desired discourse and identity are imposed on society. Furthermore, a privatised quasi-public media sphere helps to form an agenda that suits the interests of those in power in society, while genuine opinions are marginalised. In these conditions, all social and political processes become staged collective media rituals. The main goal of such media rituals is the privatisation of the public sphere and the transformation of the electoral process into a "mediacracy" — a democracy of the audience or viewers — as described in detail by the French political scientist B. Manin (Manin, 1997, p. 223).

Having been appropriated by global elites subordinate to their economic interests, many states lose their powers, replacing them with media and bureaucratic rituals. This gives rise to the phenomenon of the ritualistic state.

To maintain influence over society through these collective rituals, false identities such as nationalism, political and religious isolationism are imposed over the society, and these are proposed to be defended by violent, ritualistic means that do not require rational justification — thus forming modern fundamentalism. This is nothing more than the ancient Roman principle of "divide and rule". P. Bourdieu notes that "this kind of relationship to one's identity as nationally constituted is the product of institutions, but also of all state rituals" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 144).

According to leading contemporary sociologists, religious and political fundamentalism is the main source of violence in society and the main challenge to processes of global integration in the 21st century (Giddens, 2002, p. 48). The roots of fundamentalism lie in manipulative groups' desire to control society by appealing to biological

herd instincts and the collective archetypal unconscious through the power of rituals.

Along with the degradation and appropriation of states and the absorption of their sovereignty by a global oligarchic power, this approach replaces the rule of law with the rule of force. It provokes international conflicts and violence and threatens world peace by replacing democracy with a global dictatorship of a technocratic corporate superstate.

Since the end of the last century, the development of social media, globalisation, public dialogue and people's diplomacy on the Internet, as well as social services and platforms, has led to the formation of a full-fledged international discussion, people's diplomacy, public sphere and global civil society. This emerging society, free from state restrictions and bureaucracy, is demonstrating its capacity for self-organisation. A global activism movement is emerging that aims to protect human rights and freedoms, restore justice and ensure favourable social and environmental conditions. Global activist movements that are not linked to states and their policies are emerging on the Internet.

Based on the concept of popular sovereignty, it is reasonable to conclude that, as a global civil society emerges, it can and should become the sole sovereign and the ultimate source of power at a global level. This process can be termed the global transition of sovereignty from peoples to global civil society.

The expression of the will of this new global sovereign should be the formation of the highest level of legal norms, basic norms accepted by all in the perspective of everyone, the rights of peoples — global law, a global constitution.

However, given the competitive nature of professional politics, there are reasonable doubts about the ability of political leaders to achieve a global consensus in the interests of civilisation. In addition, scholars point to the absence of a recognised international body capable of providing the world with such a constitution in the foreseeable future (Magun, 2020, pp. 52-53). These concerns are valid insofar as the crisis in international politics cannot be resolved through political means, including violent ones.

However, if we consider global society, connected by dialogue on the Internet, to be the true sovereign — the source of supreme power — then it is possible to assume that it will adopt a declaration of global sovereignty and a global constitutional act through mechanisms of direct network democracy, such as global voting (approval) on the Internet. This would not preclude these acts being approved by the legislatures of individual states and their international associations.

In my work *Global Alternative* (Izmestyev, 2023), which describes the principles of global revolution and democratic initiative, I proposed that global associations of activists should be considered the initiators of a declaration of global sovereignty and a global constitutional act. However, the circle of initiators could potentially be much wider.

In addition to the democratic initiatives emerging on the Internet, existing global associations of believers of traditional world religions, which are a vivid and long-standing example of such associations, could seriously claim this mission.

Despite signs of the suppression of the public sphere and the appropriation of popular sovereignty in many modern

states, history shows that genuine democratic traditions and civil society institutions, combined with the freedom offered by network technologies, provide a real opportunity for popular movements and individual state governments to become the initiators of global sovereignty.

The revival of pluralism and democracy at the national level could establish such societies and states as leaders and initiators of a global popular revolution.

History provides examples of bourgeois and socialist revolutions that marked the beginning of the global transition of sovereignty from sovereign monarchs to the peoples of the world.

In this sense, the formation of the United States of America as an act of popular democratic initiative in opposition to British imperialism and colonialism is a special case. The public initiative of the population of the British colonies in North America to adopt a declaration of independence and sovereignty marked the beginning of a unique voluntary union based on democracy and popular sovereignty.

According to the renowned sociologist T. Parsons, this formed a unique social order based on the finest traditions of European popular sovereignty, British constitutionalism, and the spiritual principles of the Bible shared by various Abrahamic religions and denominations (Parsons, 1971, p. 86).

In this case, the founding power of popular sovereignty was realised to the greatest possible extent thanks to the following factors.

Firstly, it was a pure act of societal self-organisation, as the struggle for independence had eliminated the absolutist state and the aristocratic elites who had appropriated it. "The

American population was overwhelmingly non-aristocratic in origin and did not develop an indigenous aristocracy. Furthermore, a considerable proportion of the originally upper-class elements left the country during the American Revolution. Granting of titles came to be forbidden by the Constitution, and factors like landed proprietorship and wealth have no legal recognition as criteria for government office and authority. Although American society has always been differentiated internally by class, it has never suffered the aftermath of aristocracy and serfdom that persisted so long in Europe", notes T. Parsons (Parsons, 1971, p. 90).

Secondly, the sufficient development of print media during this period formed a full-fledged public sphere in which there was a demand for a just social order.

Thirdly, the colonists were organised primarily into agricultural and religious communities that had no clear national bonds, and which were characterised by religious tolerance and pluralism (Parsons, 1971, p. 87).

Unfortunately, the level of global connectivity at the end of the 18th century did not allow this initiative to spark global transformation. Nevertheless, the experience and principles of American democracy laid the foundations for numerous revolutionary changes, as well as the standards of the modern democratic European state.

The very principle of American federalism can be regarded as a model of vertical separation of powers between the supreme legislative authority, which is universal and stable, and the regulatory and executive authorities of individual states, which is applicable to the organisation of a new global social order.

Being partly a prototype of a global future in the form of a "united states of the world", but still having a branched

administrative apparatus of legal coercion at the federal level, as well as a system of parliamentary representation subject to the influence of a global oligarchy, the United States today is a typical modern state, subject to the negative factors of political crisis and representative democracy, just like any other in the world.

A unique situation arose in the post-revolutionary Soviet republic, where a people's state and a unique social order were established, and the aristocratic elite that had usurped sovereignty was destroyed or expelled by the revolutionary society.

The Soviet project offered society a return to direct democracy, replacing parliamentarism and representation wherever possible, and the "Moral Code of the Communist Builder" concentrated traditional law. Indeed, "the original Leninist 'party of the new type' was much closer to activism than to classical parliamentarism" (Izmestyev, 2023, p. 104en).

This model of social order, somewhat similar to the American model, initially envisaged the "withering away of the state" as power was transferred from the people's councils to a global civil forum of workers — the "Worldwide International" (Comintern). However, a narrow, politicised class approach to organising social order, the rapid de facto appropriation of popular sovereignty by the political elite, and underdeveloped social media connectivity prevented the idea of councils from being fully realised and, even more so, scaled up at the global level.

However, as recent events have shown, the development of network technologies of freedom and social media globalisation present us with unique examples of democratic alternatives in the politics of individual modern states.

104en

At the same time, we must recognise that the incompatibility of the existing social order's foundations and principles with humanity's goals poses a global existential threat and requires global solutions. The partial restoration of popular sovereignty in individual societies and states can only serve as an example or a catalyst for global transformation. The true expression and foundation of a new rational social order can only be a global constitution, as J. Habermas puts it, "accepted by all in the perspective of everyone" (Habermas, 1998, p. 33).

Such a constitution should embody the highest level of world legislation, as proposed by many philosophers and scholars. This would ensure that all norms and laws adopted at national and international levels cannot contradict its provisions, which would have direct effect throughout the entire human habitat.

The existence of such a constitutional act will create a special vertical system of checks and balances between global legislative power and executive power at the state level, preventing possible usurpation and abuse by the latter through the use of lawmaking for their own benefit. Moreover, this state of affairs will become the ultimate embodiment of the principle of the supremacy (dominion) of law at the global level. A historical analogue for the adoption of such fundamental norms is the process of accepting the Faith by followers of world religions without the participation of politicians and states.

Unfortunately, modern legal science cannot claim to engage in genuine discourse about the fate and future of the state as a social institution. This is because most scientific organisations are state-owned or state-funded, making them de facto agents of the state. The state itself is far from welcoming

criticism, and in undemocratic countries it is even prohibited. P. Bourdieu draws attention to this when he speaks of the risk of "applying state thinking to the state" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 3).

It is wrong to view the state itself as a social institution that poses a threat to the development of society. Since the state is inherently instrumental in nature, it is important to ask whose interests it serves and on what principles.

Against the backdrop of an obvious crisis in this social institution and its appropriation by interested groups and their global patrons, there are increasing calls in the scientific community for a return to moral principles as the basis for organising state power. For example, the contemporary legal scholar S. Baburin speaks of society's legitimate demand for a moral state (Baburin, 2020).

Contemporary sociology also assesses the maturity of civil society and the importance of constitutional law in terms of its degree of autonomy from state power (Parsons, 1971, p. 19).

It could be argued that the idea of creating a moral state was the starting point for this study.

In the context of the ideology of the global transition of sovereignty from peoples to global society, the future of the state is as follows.

Of course, it is unlikely that Friedrich Engels' idea of the withering away of the state (Engels, 1961, p. 292) will be realised any time soon, but its role in society is subject to significant transformation.

As legislative powers are transferred to the supranational level in the form of a global system of direct network democracy and global constitutionalism, states will be reduced to a distributed system of executive bodies.

In fact, states were originally created to perform executive functions, representing an apparatus of legal coercion for the purpose of carrying out the will of sovereigns. At the same time, in traditional society, the will of the sovereign (God or the community) was initially expressed by the church or institutions of direct democracy: assemblies, popular gatherings, Scandic *things* (public gatherings), forums, as well as dictated by folk traditions and church laws.

The personified sovereign-legislator only appeared in the Westphalian political system during the era of absolutism and for a short period, leading to revolutionary events. Even in this construct, the monarch's sovereignty was originally considered to be the highest divine sovereignty, descending from the Holy Church.

Thus, sovereignty has always been external to and superior to the executive apparatus of the state.

In the proposed concept of global vertical separation of powers, legislative power must be balanced by distributed executive power to prevent individual administrations from exploiting global law-making powers for their own benefit. At the same time, adopting global laws would make it difficult to interfere in the governance of individual territories. However, the formation of a global state as an executive system could ignore the needs and interests of individual peoples, and in the event of a power grab, could lead to a planetary dictatorship, as Immanuel Kant warned in his works (Kant, 1965*b*, Vol. 4, p. 103).

As for the judicial branch, its powers should be divided between the global and national levels as the primary and appealing and supervisory levels of jurisdiction. The highest supranational level of justice would act as a guarantee

against judicial arbitrariness at the level of individual states. Such a practice already exists in the EU today.

It should be understood that, over time, judicial functions will gradually be transferred to AI-based computer systems, which should ensure impartiality and uniformity in resolving cases throughout the global legal space. The lack of personality in AI, as understood by humans, is somehow considered a significant drawback today, which developers are trying their best to overcome. Contemporary researchers note that AI is merely a programme with no social experience, subjectivity or personality. This means that it has no interests of its own that would cause it to act to the detriment of people for its own sake, making it independent.

However, doesn't the absence of an emotional component and personality in today's AI make it a unique tool for the objective and rational analysis of legal disputes and offences, free from personal bias due to its lack of subjectivity and personality? AI is the ideal impartial judge, which humans can never be. Moreover, why would we need an AI judge with a personality when there are already millions of such judges with human weaknesses and emotions on Earth?

Therefore, AI, being devoid of personality in the human sense, can become a unique tool for electronic justice at any level.

As connectivity grows, populations become more mobile, economic ties strengthen and it becomes impossible to fully regulate legal relations by national law in globalised areas, many branches of law will require their foundations to be adopted in the form of global codes. This primarily concerns the regulation of a wide range of civil and financial relations,

relations concerning global information exchange and the creation of a single, global list of criminal offences, in order to prevent the abuse of criminal law at a national level.

Criminologists rightly point out that, in today's world, "cases of the deliberate criminalisation of acts that are not socially dangerous but are considered as such only by a small group of people in power, in order to protect their violation of public interests, are not unheard of. This is particularly characteristic of states with authoritarian, undemocratic regimes" (Ragimov, 2013, p. 13).

At the same time, from a spiritual point of view, only violations of religious commandments and prohibitions established by the sacred texts of traditional world religions can be considered "crimes".

States must retain a wide range of administrative powers, including establishing administrative liability for violations of management rules and procedures adopted in accordance with global legislation.

Thus, in the context of the global transition of sovereignty, states, as the executive power and the apparatus of legal coercion, will acquire a new meaning that has always been theirs as an instrument for executing the sovereign people's will, enshrined in law within the system of global democracy and the separation of powers.

In conditions where the exponential growth of information exchange technologies and the self-awareness and self-identification of global society make such a prospect possible and achievable, the main question becomes how to fill the universal constitution with fundamental norms that are accepted by all in the perspective of everyone. A logical question arises: where can we find norms that everyone is willing to agree on?

Perhaps the only way to achieve global consensus is through the singularity of spiritual and scientific knowledge about the world, only by turning to the deep spiritual origins and traditions of our civilisation. Can global law be spiritual? I think it cannot be otherwise if it is to be accepted by all in the perspective of everyone, voluntarily, without dictation or violence.

CHAPTER V.
GLOBAL SPIRITUAL PRINCIPLES

The spiritual laws expressed in the sacred texts have been and remain an expression of the natural need of individuals and society for freedom, peace and justice. They have been created and refined over thousands of years to ensure the survival of the human union. They are the cornerstone of our society, the foundation of our entire worldview and culture.

When you make statements like this, you can expect some criticism. The main argument from people who disagree will be that differences in religious views, conflicts between religions, movements, and denominations throughout human history have probably been the most common and significant cause of conflicts, wars, massacres, and persecution.

However, researchers of religious conflicts rightly point out that the fundamental principles of traditional religions, particularly Abrahamic ones, are essentially the same and "began with a defiant rejection of inequity and systemic violence" (Armstrong, 2014, p. 122). Upon closer examination, any "religious violence" mentioned by historians represents the exploitation and distortion of religious ideals by politicians and the replacement of believers' religious feelings with predatory aggression and nationalism.

However, it can be agreed that simply enshrining the religious dogmas and postulates of individual religions or denominations in law does not bode well.

When discussing spiritual principles, it is important to distinguish them from the dogmas of existing religions.

Sacred texts lie at the root of all traditional world religions. Thus, at the heart of the Abrahamic religions is the Jewish Torah, which is referred to as the Old Testament (or Pentateuch) in the Holy Bible.

Later sacred teachings, such as the New Testament and the Koran, are based on the principles of the Mosaic Torah.

As many researchers have noted, the fundamental principles of Buddhism, a major religion in the East, are remarkably similar to those of the Torah and therefore of the Abrahamic religions of Judaism, Christianity and Islam.

Existing religious movements and organisations have been significantly influenced by society and the state throughout their historical development. Having given rise to all legal authority, they were eventually removed from the direct control of society by politicians. Later, many of these organisations were appropriated by ruling elites, who turned them into state institutions and political instruments for controlling society. Thus, state and political contradictions gradually manifested themselves in the narratives and cults of modern religious associations.

As with states, which became appropriated (governmentalised) institutions during the era of absolutism, religious organisations have undergone processes of dogmatisation and ritualisation.

The special role of dogmas and rituals in the subjugation of society by the ruling elites is worthy of a dedicated mention. Both phenomena, as applied to religion and state politics, which Rousseau rightly called "civil religion" (Rousseau, 1998), create conditions for the emergence of fundamentalism as a means of manipulating society by the ruling elites through media rituals and ritual violence.

In this regard, it is particularly important that the world community adopts a global agreement (constitution) based on spiritual principles directly, without the interference of politicians or business lobbyists, through direct democracy and digital equality. This universal social contract should be signed online by everyone, who would thereby commit to following spiritual principles within the framework of a great human union.

Unfortunately, under pressure from politicians and governments, religious organisations have actually been removed from the management of society over the last three centuries. This does not diminish their great contribution to the preservation of the true values of civilisation, nor does it weaken their potential to reform the social order in the future.

One would like to believe that the formation of a global civil society, a new global information community, and a global public sphere represents a genuine historical opportunity for liberation and revival for modern religions, as well as for states. In a society that has rejected the competitive political paradigm, who else but religions should play the role of spiritual unifier of peoples?

Among the world's Abrahamic religions, Judaism has followed a unique path. Historically, from the beginning of our era until the middle of the last century, this religion, like the Jewish people, was not associated with any nation state. Many perceive this circumstance as a historical injustice, but it has perhaps served the religion and the Jewish people very well. Today, it is hard to find a religion that tolerates different interpretations of sacred texts more readily, or that has preserved authentic theosophical movements within itself. Indeed, many of the talents of this small people, manifested throughout the world, can safely be attributed

to the creative and spiritual forces they did not expend on creating their own territorial and state structure or on the violent subjugation and exploitation of their fellow citizens for many centuries. It could be argued that this people and their religion were ahead of their time in terms of global society. The belated re-establishment of the state and state religion by the people of Israel on the eve of a new global era is unlikely to contribute to global integration processes, as it significantly diverts forces, talents, and resources away from Jewish society and towards state-building.

For most peoples, the creation of a territorially separate state was a matter of survival during the transition to agriculture, to protect their land and crops. This is hardly a pressing issue for Israel in today's post-industrial reality. While the Jewish people's natural right to a historical homeland cannot be questioned, it could be argued that territorial statehood has become a kind of "Trojan horse" for a people who were leaders in creating a distributed state (not tied to a territory) — a new image of the states of the global future. This gives us food for thought. I hope Israel will be able to combine these two paths of development fruitfully in the current century, participating in the process of forming a global civil society.

Returning to the spiritual foundations of traditional religions, an analysis of the Holy Books reveals them to be monuments to the natural laws developed by human society, or received from higher powers, to regulate social relations and ensure the survival and development of humanity under any future conditions.

If we abstract from the historical and artistic components of the sacred texts, the main problem they address is the duality and internal contradictions of human

nature. They speak of the contradiction between man's biological (animal) instincts and natural egocentrism, which are conditioned by the legacy of the evolutionary struggle for survival, and reason and conscious, rational behaviour aimed at communication and mutual support for the survival of society as a whole. At the same time, the basic biological irrational programme is labelled "sinful", while rational social behaviour is labelled "spiritual". This duality of consciousness and the internal contradictions of individuals and society are regulated by the sacred texts.

Modern science fully corroborates the ideas of the sacred texts, referring to rational unification as a "social imperative". "That openly or secretly, consciously or unconsciously, we applaud violence's success can be inspected only in terms of human unreason and humanity's original sin. Yet we do. And as if subconsciously aware of our weakness, we find the principality of violent demand becoming a striking invention, still another tribute to the ingenuity of man in fulfilling his innate, seldom-recognized animal needs. The sub-group has transferred the attractions of old-time warfare to a contemporary social scene where the nuclear veto is impossible. But impossible likewise is the invention. We know that Rousseau's vision of a primal world in which solitary man was good, amiable, without need or animosity for his fellow, never existed in man's dimmest beginnings or can exist in man's most remote consummations. Likewise we know that the Hobbesian view of a primal world in which every man warred against every man could never have existed as it can never exist. Neither Rousseau nor Hobbes in those pre-Darwinian days recognized that the social imperative has always been with us and must be

with us till the last human spark goes out. Nor has the social imperative ever so compelled us as it compels us today… If we see, clearly and with conviction, that every human baby born bears the potential resources of the arsonist, the vandal, the murderer, then we shall raise our children differently. If our educational philosophy accepts individual responsibility, not social guilt, as the final determinant of conduct, then we shall see some remarkable changes in the curriculum presented to our students. If we, social members as a whole, agree that no longer shall we applaud the violent, no longer shall we extend our charity to the violator while we ignore the violated, then a quite simple event may take place. Violence, whatever its temptations, could go out of fashion," writes Robert Ardrey (Ardrey, 1970, pp. 293-294, 339-340).

The Torah requires a person to exercise constant control over their intentions based on the need for peaceful coexistence and social justice. It condemns selfishness arising from animal instincts in the evolutionary struggle for survival within a species. At the same time, solidarity and altruism are exalted as spiritual qualities given by God. However, at the level of the Torah (the Pentateuch of Moses), these principles mainly apply to members of the same tribe within a single nation. This is because, when these laws were created, people lived in relative isolation and the public sphere was defined by a single tradition, territory and language.

The basic spiritual principles of the Torah (Old Testament) can be summarised as follows: awe of the Creator, faith and love for one's neighbour as oneself.

In classical theology, "awe" or "reverence" is understood as fear and worship. However, from the perspective of Jewish

theosophy, this principle can be interpreted differently. Due to the fact that the terms Creator and nature have the same numerical and alphabetic designation in Hebrew, and everything that exists is understood as the Creator, this principle can be viewed as an attitude of sensitivity and care (a fear of causing harm) towards the surrounding world, the natural environment, and humans as part of it — the result of the act of creation in the image of the Creator.

Thus, caring for ecology and the natural environment in the broadest sense can be considered a basic spiritual principle.

At a primitive, almost animalistic stage of development, humanity exploited natural resources in a predatory manner for its own development, as if nature could provide them indefinitely.

However, as development progresses and consumption increases, the environmental burden grows exponentially. Like all previous dominant species, we risk depleting our environment's resources and ending our existence through extinction. The authors of ancient sacred texts somehow understood this threat, bequeathing to us an attitude of reverence towards the nature that created us.

A way to express this tremble before nature may be the principle of just nature use when everything taken from it is compensated for and replenished by human labour.

Since we are part of a single natural environment (ecosystem) and are connected to it to the utmost degree, this principle of existence directly affects the survival of humanity as a species. It is more than worthy of a leading place among the principles of global law.

The next Old Testament principle is to love your neighbour as yourself. Received together with the Torah,

this unifying call was also the condition for the survival of the people of Israel. What does this principle mean?

The concept of "love" has many meanings and, in everyday usage, tends to refer to family or marital relationships, as well as a person's attachment to something or someone. However, if we consider the meanings embedded in this concept in the biblical languages (originally Aramaic or Hebrew), we can define the closest modern concepts for the term "love" as "acceptance" or "relationship". Indeed, this Old Testament principle is repeatedly explained as treating one's fellow tribesmen as one would like to be treated, or not doing to others what one would not want done to oneself.

Consequently, the social formula for this principle is to treat one's fellow tribesmen as close, equal human beings.

Since ancient times, society has been based on the family, bound by blood ties. Over time, this expanded to include the concept of the clan — the family in a broader sense. Within the framework of kinship relations, it was natural for ancient people to sympathise with and empathise with their relatives as much as possible, acting in solidarity with them for the benefit of the family and clan. According to biologists, these relationships have deep genetic roots inherited through evolution from the animal world. They stem from the desire to preserve and spread a related genotype through natural selection and intraspecific competition.

Another type of relationship has historically developed between members of different families and clans. These were characterised by competition for resources and habitat, and an intraspecific struggle in which a representative with a

different genotype was regarded as an "alien", a competitor and a potential threat. This had the same biological basis.

As social structures became more complex and people transitioned to a sedentary lifestyle and agriculture during the Neolithic Revolution, the need for inter-clan cooperation and the formation of more complex social structures arose. A necessary condition for this was the rejection of internal strife, which was achieved through inter-clan marriages and the establishment of communal living rules.

The fundamental rule of coexistence that emerged in the new society was the principle of community formation, whereby all members regarded and accepted each other as "their own", as close and equal to themselves like blood relatives.

The community became the first and most universal form of social organisation, manifesting society's natural desire for self-organisation based on peace, equality, justice, personal freedom, and public interaction. Communities are characterised by shared values and traditions, and a common cultural and communicative space thanks to a single language and culture. Most importantly, it developed a free sphere of discussion based on natural direct democracy, involvement, openness and transparency in relationships. According to Jürgen Habermas' terminology, this can be called the public sphere or authentic society (Habermas, 1989).

Without renouncing intra-species competition and without the formation of spiritual kinship, the existence of the community would have been impossible. These principles of coexistence are mentioned in the Old Testament as a condition for the survival of the people of Israel.

In accordance with spiritual principles, the first laws of coexistence were established to guarantee community members (initially free men) equal rights and freedoms, including the right to participate in self-government and the fair resolution of disputes. The primary objective of these laws and codes was to prevent the emergence and preservation of inequality through violence, a concept referred to by Aristotle as "pleonexia" (Aristotle, 2011).

The beginning of the second millennium AD was a significant yet tragic period during which humanity returned to the path of the bioprogramme in response to existential challenges such as climate change, epidemics and invasions by wild tribes. This manifested as a return to the old Roman imperial paradigm based on collective egoism. Rejecting spiritual global principles and community spirit marked a return to animalistic intra-species competition and the struggle for survival. Surprisingly, the collapse of the "Roman project" taught society nothing. Departing from the primacy of spiritual principles in this way can safely be called "the great delusion".

For a thousand years, this established a biological social order in the form of politics and markets, with spiritual institutions subordinated to states and used by politicians as a tool for appropriating and controlling society. In the 20th century, spirituality was finally rejected by states and replaced by nationalist ideology (collective egoism), and competition, violence and greed in the form of politics and markets were elevated to the status of the principle of social governance.

"The absorption of all social functions by the State necessarily favoured the development of unbridled, narrow-minded individualism. In proportion as the obligations

towards the State grew in numbers the citizens were evidently relieved from their obligations towards each other," notes P. Kropotkin (Kropotkin, 2007, p. 177). The result of this "great delusion" is the profound existential crisis of our time.

Interestingly, the Roman imperial project in its initial form lasted about a thousand years, roughly the same amount of time it took for its revival.

An analysis of biblical texts reveals that the violation of the basic principle of loving one's neighbour is the emergence of inequality by violent means, or the preservation of inequality through violence or the threat of its use. It was Aristotle's "pleonexia" that became the general concept of sin in the Holy Scriptures.

In the broadest sense, sovereign politics involves the violent preservation of a social group's past superiority, whether internal or external, achieved through violence (e.g. seizure of territories or enslavement of the population). What is this if not the triumph of collective egoism?

From the perspective of traditional world religions, social organisation is based on the religious community, which is united by common spirituality, tradition and, most importantly, the principle of loving one's neighbour.

In the spiritual tradition, the term "love" conceals the principle of equal rights and freedoms for every person, as well as their right to be considered equal, regardless of their characteristics (tolerance).

This fundamental principle of social coexistence was originally intended to ensure a conflict-free environment within a given community (nation) in order to guarantee its survival and ability to ensure collective security. In that distant period of civilisation's formation, intra-species

"natural selection" took place between tribes and peoples competing for existing resources and territories. Given that the tribes and peoples of antiquity were small in number and at a low stage of technological development, violent competition between them did not threaten the existence of humanity as a species. In a sense, such natural intra-species competition even contributed to development and progress.

The result of this natural selection — the continuation of the biological programme in the social sphere — was the emergence of politics and markets, the formation of ancient states and trade unions, and ultimately the empires of antiquity, which were violent superstructures imposed over society that "imposed very moderate loyalty" among their subjects (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 188).

More than a thousand years later, the principle of love for one's neighbour was refined in the Divine Teachings of Jesus Christ in the New Testament.

The meaning of this new interpretation of this spiritual principle in the New Testament doctrine implies the application of equal rights and freedoms not only within a single nation, but to every human being created by God, regardless of any imposed identities.

Historically, by the time the New Testament was written, the development of human society had led peoples to the beginning of global interaction, which led to an increase in collective conflicts as they continued their biological programme of struggle for existence.

Resident agricultural communities formed states and alliances. Consequently, the natural biological urge to fight for survival (individual egocentrism) shifted to the realm of collective interests. Under the leadership of the emerging military aristocracy, national, cultural and religious

identities emerged, dividing people and pitting them against each other. This resulted in a significant escalation in wars and violence.

The sacred wisdom of Christ's Teaching, when "Christ not only offered salvation to souls but also freed the religious community from previous territorial and ethnic ascriptions" (Parsons, 1971, p. 31), lies in understanding the existential threat posed to humanity by division into imposed artificial identities and the continuation of natural selection within species in the form of political struggle and economic expansion. With this approach, as scientific and technological progress advances, we are inevitably brought to the brink of total mutual destruction. This is the path of all previous dominant biological species on our planet, and extinction is inevitable.

The principle of equality (accepting others as equals) is closely linked to the innate sense of justice fundamental to human consciousness.

It should be noted that all political conflicts and organised violence in human society are the result of the struggle to create and maintain inequality. In turn, this inequality is almost always the result of previous violence in the "heroic" past.

Thus, in the course of struggles between tribes and peoples, some peoples used force or deception to create better conditions for themselves in terms of habitat, climate, and access to natural and mineral resources, usually by seizing territories, violent conquest, or forcing other tribes out of disputed territories. What legal doctrine refers to as territorial sovereignty, with the rare exception of island states, is the result of conquests, a product of past violence. Our own history is mostly perceived by us not as the history

of peoples, their achievements, feelings, and sufferings, but as a series of victories and defeats of military leaders and chiefs. In this context, it is always extremely toxic for justifying any present-day rights or claims.

Similarly, social and property stratification within individual societies, which arose through the conversion of military and priestly power into economic and political power, is maintained by the apparatus of state violence appropriated by the ruling elite.

Thus, national identities artificially created by politicians, along with the class identities they cultivate, serve to divide people in an irreconcilable struggle to preserve inequality. Without overcoming this, neither love for one's neighbour, nor eternal peace, nor equality, nor justice, nor the very survival of humanity will be possible.

The New Testament's core principle of loving your neighbour as yourself can be seen as embodying universal equality, human rights and freedoms, and the universal recognition of every person's equality through the restoration of social justice and rejection of imposed, artificial identities.

In a religious sense, injustice (or sin) can be defined as unnatural (not originally intended by the Creator) inequality achieved and/or maintained through the use of violence or the threat of violence. This inequality must not stem from the essence of the created world and the plan of its Creator.

It is no coincidence that the biblical principle of loving one's neighbour is supplemented by the clarifying phrase "as unto thyself". This is the condition for equality and accepting others as equals. Without this recognition, there can be no true love in society or in general. It may be pity, fear or something else.

Unlike animals, who are guided solely by natural survival instincts, humans have an additional element: the freedom to choose between natural survival instincts and rational unity through the recognition of equality with their neighbours. The entire biological world is built on the principles of inequality and competition. Indeed, we have successfully adopted these principles in the establishment of the current social order.

By realising freedom of choice in favour of equality, the idea of brotherhood as rational integration into a harmonious community becomes achievable. It is interesting that these slogans are associated with social revolutions demanding freedom, equality, and brotherhood ("*Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité*" — the slogan of the French Revolution).

The realisation of the principle of a fraternal community makes the spiritual ideals of justice and peace ("*pace et iustitia*", Latin) achievable. These ideals are essentially opposed to the inequality and violence of the competitive animal world. This results in a unique formula for implementing spiritual principles in the social sphere, where freedom of choice is the right not to act in accordance with natural instinct, which is inherent only to rational humans. K. Lorenz comes to a similar conclusion, stating, "Our freest will underlies strict moral laws, and one of the reasons for our longing for freedom is to prevent our obeying other laws (biological ones — author's note) than these" (Lorenz, 2002, p. 225).

Existing political and economic systems perpetuate inequality and injustice. This is primarily due to the unequal distribution of political and economic rights and opportunities among citizens of different countries by birth.

Consequently, the rights and freedoms acquired by citizens around the world vary greatly from country to

country. Additionally, significant differences in the value of labour for citizens of different countries with comparable qualifications and labour costs are dictated by the state of the economy and national currency exchange rates, which depend on stock market speculation and politics.

Solving this problem through changing citizenship is difficult and often limited by political barriers, not to mention the significant financial costs involved. This creates a kind of "civil slavery" or "civil inequality" that cannot be overcome except by changing the social order through global legislation.

The minimum requirement for achieving global equitable equality, in the sense of John Rawls' theory of justice (Rawls, 1971), can be considered to be at least guaranteeing equal human rights and freedoms at the global level through the status of global citizenship, alongside national citizenship.

This leads to another New Testament principle: the global unity of humanity in God. As the Apostle Paul wrote, there will be "neither Greek nor Jew" (New Testament, Colossians 3:11).

This is the most important sacred principle of spiritual globalisation, stemming from the idea of equal rights and rejecting imposed identities. This presupposes a qualitatively new phenomenon for biological nature, as described by the French philosopher Pierre Teilhard de Chardin in his work *The Phenomenon of Man* (Teilhard de Chardin, 2008). Rather than a biological programme of struggle for survival, humanity is transitioning to intelligent integration in the name of common survival and progress.

V. Vernadsky, speaking about the unity of the noosphere (Vernadsky, 2013, p. 17), considers the densification of the Earth's population and the growth of its communicative interconnection as a factor in the compression of intelligent

matter to a kind of "critical mass", upon reaching which a "chain reaction" will take place — a qualitative transition to integral unity.

This process can be described as the achievement of the "singularity" of human self-awareness, when civilisation realises its unity on a planetary scale, appearing as a pale blue dot amidst the elemental chaos of the boundless cosmos.

Indeed, all of humanity's progress, or civilisation, can be seen as a conscious rejection of the biological programme of species evolution that we inherited in the form of a struggle for survival, in favour of rational social interaction for the common good and development.

The first stage of this transformation of consciousness is the formation of a public sphere within tribes and the societies they created, where violence is replaced by open public discussion and the development of shared values within the community. This public sphere was characterised by open, direct communication between community members, and most importantly, the public nature of such communication. This made everyone accountable and open to criticism and condemnation, and made their actions and motives understandable to all. Communication was based on a common language, culture, and traditions. In this natural communal environment, the desire for peace, freedom and justice inherent in a healthy society was realised.

As traditional transnational spiritual associations — world religions — emerged, this public sphere, based on shared values and the language of religions, gradually expanded. At this stage, through the formation of religious law, basic spiritual values were transformed into legal acts. At the same time, religious norms and principles served as

a supranational constitution, which were accepted by all in the perspective of everyone (enjoyed absolute recognition), were as unchanging as possible (enjoyed stability) and acted directly, regardless of legislative and subordinate acts (featured the property of supremacy).

"The conception of the Christian Church as both divine and human was of theological origin. Its conception as a voluntary association, with strong overtones of egalitarianism and corporate independence relative to the social environment, owed much to the institutional models of antiquity. St. Augustine's use of the term 'city', essentially in the sense of polis, was a striking symbol. Certainly, the Church was an association of religious 'citizens', parallel to the polis" (Parsons, 1971, p. 32), which can be characterised as a universal spiritual civil community, a "politeuma" (*Πολίτευμα*, Greek) of the Apostle Paul (New Testament, Philippians 3:20).

The principle of love for one's neighbour is closely related to the basic Old Testament principle of "awe of the Creator", which we discussed earlier.

To understand the social significance of this principle, we must remember that it stems from the concept of "unity of creation", meaning that everything in the world, including the world itself, was created by God. The Old Testament speaks of the Creator's satisfaction with His creation. Accordingly, our relationship with God must take into account respect for His creation and reverence for His will.

Furthermore, as we have already mentioned, in the tradition of religious interpretation of the Torah, the name of God the Creator and the nature that surrounds us is expressed by similar terms, "Elohim" and "Teva", which denote the manifestation of one Supreme Power.

Man, created by God in His image and likeness, plays a special part as the "crown of creation".

What implications does this spiritual principle have in a social context?

Apart from concluding that we must preserve the environment (the ecological aspect), this principle also has another important consequence: a reverent attitude towards human beings themselves as "the image of God". This is reflected in compassion and humanism as the highest societal values. Society and each individual must also recognise and respect the inherent rights and freedoms of human beings as the highest divine value and gift. This precludes the creation and maintenance of violent inequality and the exploitation of human beings as objects, commodities or resources.

Based on the New Testament doctrine of unity in God, it can be assumed that reverence should be equal for each of the images, which speaks of the supreme value of human rights and universal equality of rights and freedoms as an ancient biblical doctrine.

Thus, in agreement with ancient theologians, the principle of reverence can also be considered a derivative of the basic principle of loving one's neighbour.

The Old Testament principle of faith is directly connected to the principle of the value and equality of rights and freedoms.

The principle of Faith can be seen as a requirement for uncritical adherence to spiritual postulates and tradition. From a positive point of view, one can agree with this principle as a requirement to observe spiritual law, the Mosaic Commandments. These Commandments themselves represent a set of basic principles and rules of social behaviour, the first legal "code" given from Above.

At first glance, the first four Commandments (prohibition of worshipping other gods, prohibition of idolatry, prohibition of using God's name in vain, and prohibition of working on the Sabbath) appear to relate exclusively to spiritual tradition and have no specific regulations for social relations. However, they are socially significant in that they unite believers and the people under a single tradition. This allows them to perceive each other as "their own" and equal before God, in accordance with the principle of loving one's neighbour. It also allows them to form a single socio-cultural and communicative trusted space — the community.

Legally, they are important in defining the circle of subjects of regulated social relations and in separating "their" people (the Israelites) from others.

The following six commandments represent syncretic specific norms of prohibitions and prescriptions governing the behaviour of people in the community.

Philosophically speaking, the Old Testament principle of faith has a number of meanings.

The first is encountering God and acknowledging His eternal example and leadership. Religiously speaking, this is expressed through the obligation to observe the Commandments (obedience and fidelity). A second meaning, closer to the New Testament tradition and originating from the Greek language, is the trust between God and believers, and the mutual trust, support, and sponsorship that exists within the community of believers.

In this sense, the principle of faith is a derivative of the principle of loving one's neighbour. This is because acceptance and equality can only be based on mutual trust and vouching for one's neighbour as one would for oneself or one's equal.

In the social sphere, fidelity to the Covenants can be seen as the voluntary acceptance of recognised legal norms accepted by all in the perspective of everyone for the sake of the common good, and therefore for one's own good.

This principle results in such social relations as open (trusted) communication and voluntary association for common goals, known as solidarity. It can be said that the implementation of this principle results in popular sovereignty or democracy in society.

Thus, in social terms, the Old Testament tradition requires the recognition and equality of individual rights as the highest value, mutual trust and unity within the framework of direct public democracy in jointly solving global problems of humanity, replacing politics with activism, as well as caring for the preservation of the natural and social environment, and careful, responsible and reasonable use of natural resources.

For centuries, human morality and culture have developed the biblical principle of controlling the mind (spirit) over animal instincts (temptation and sin) in society. Thanks to the efforts of religions, philosophers and educators over the centuries, people have learned the benefits of rational cooperation in society. Today, they prioritise rational behaviour in a society, sometimes out of fear of punishment. Within communities or nations, people tend to treat their neighbours as they would their fellow tribesmen or compatriots.

This has been facilitated by the doctrines of equality and national identity introduced by revolutions and created by politicians and philosophers at the behest of educated states. Societies provide a system of condemnation and punishment for those who violate this principle.

At the same time, the principle of the struggle for survival and access to resources and territory, inherited from natural selection, continues to prevail between different peoples, states and public spheres in foreign relations.

The essence of any politics stems from this biological principle of the struggle for survival, and, as the German strategist Carl Clausewitz wrote, its ultimate expression is war to destroy the competitor (Clausewitz, 2007, p. 25).

The biblical principle of altruism — personal self-sacrifice for the sake of others, instilled in people's minds by religion, without the participation of transnational religions that unite civilisations in social governance — has thus not been adequately implemented in relations between peoples and states.

As a result of secularisation policies and the replacement of transnational spirituality with nationalist ideologies appropriated by state elites, in the eyes of modern society, the concept of "neighbour" has been reduced to a person of one's own identity, artificially imposed by politicians on the basis of race, nationality, citizenship, religious or political beliefs. Combined with the herd nature of our animal essence, inherited from primates, this has led to a transformation of personal selfishness into collective selfishness.

How do the mechanisms of collective degeneration and the return to a destructive biological programme in society work?

It is possible that events that affect basic animal instincts in humans serve as a mechanism for triggering processes of degradation, decivilisation, and a return to instinctive animal behaviour. The recent COVID-19 pandemic has caused a terrible atomisation of society, bringing to life

ghosts of mutual fear and distrust, and a struggle for survival. People began to see an invisible, deadly threat to themselves and their loved ones in every "other" person. This was not only a fear of infection, but also a fear of not receiving necessary medical care in the event of illness, given that there might not be enough medicine and hospital resources for everyone.

Additionally, faces hidden by medical masks contributed to the depersonalisation of individuals, turning them into an existential threat and, figuratively speaking, the embodiment of painful death.

It was to be expected that politicians around the world would seize the opportunity to try to restore their influence by dividing society and resurrecting the spectre of an all-powerful autonomous state.

Thus, mass existential fear, or even horror, was channelled by them into aggression and distrust of their neighbours, becoming a prelude to political international conflicts. Against the backdrop of a massive increase in distrust of politicians and the weakening of the role of states around the world, this situation became a wonderful and unexpected "gift" for them. The results of modern investigations suggest that the emergence of the dangerous virus may not have been a coincidence (C. I. A. Now Favours Lab Leak Theory to Explain Covid's Origins).

History provides many examples of the connection between epidemics and wars, both local and global, through the awakening of the collective unconscious of humanity.

What are the prerequisites for this social phenomenon?

Firstly, we can mention the forced destruction of a unified space for communication and discussion between people, and their artificial division based on imposed or imaginary

identities. These identities are defined by B. Anderson as "an imagined political community — and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (Anderson, 1991, p. 6).

This allows spiritual principles of solidarity to be replaced with ideological labels of "us versus them", giving elites the opportunity to implement the imperial principle of "divide and rule". With this approach, the dehumanisation of "the other" easily draws on animal fears and archetypes. And collective rituals, especially media rituals, reinforce the irrational archetypal idea.

The highest expression of the continuation of intraspecies struggle in society was the ideology of struggle for living space between nations, professed by the National Socialists. The roots of this ideology go back to the views of Social Darwinism and Malthusianism, and it became the maxim of the animal struggle for survival in the social environment. After all, at the beginning of the last century, the issue of "utilising" the excess population released by technological progress was seriously discussed as a solution to the "Malthusian trap" (Malthus, 1992, Chapter 2).

This became a clear example of the danger of implementing this biological programme in a social environment, an example of real self-destruction and extinction. Politics and economic competition, as forms of minority selfishness, shape a consumerist attitude towards people as resources for the economy or for someone else's collective (state) aspirations. This is dangerous and unacceptable.

As technology develops, the routine work needed to sustain society is increasingly becoming the responsibility of machines and robotics. This frees each person up to focus on creative exploration and spiritual improvement. This is

a gift that the human mind has truly given us in its highest form. Its abilities are truly limitless and can provide a decent life for any number of people throughout the universe.

Contemporary futurologists have high hopes for the emergence of "technosocialism", which they believe will guarantee every inhabitant of Earth a decent standard of living and conditions for creative development on an unconditional basis. They also believe that it will inevitably defeat today's "neo-feudalism" and unbridled technocratic capitalism (King, Petty, 2021, pp. 405-409).

In these conditions, existing inequality, violence and the exploitation of one person by another are dangerous vestiges of the past. The entire existing social and economic order is a system of irrational ritual violence. Anyone who has encountered the corporate or bureaucratic apparatus has been tormented by questions about the meaninglessness and unproductiveness of its ritualistic relationships. The same thing happens in society itself, when the normative social order, based on selfish competition, hinders its rational integration and development, the transformation of the social order.

The very emergence of homo sapiens was a qualitative leap in biological evolution on Earth, when the way of development of living matter based on the animal laws of natural selection had been completely depleted.

Therefore, if society were to return to its former path of development, it would mean degradation and regression.

Since ancient times, society as a communicative environment has developed into a fully-fledged public sphere. The initial union of people was the community, characterised by natural direct democracy, equality of rights, publicity and mutual responsibility of all its members, the

presence of common spiritual foundations and traditions, and the value of personal reputation. Most importantly, it was characterised by the awareness of itself as a single social organism aimed to conquer the future together.

The principles of mutual equality, acceptance (tolerance) and solidarity, expressed by traditional religions as love for one's neighbour, served as the basis for the formation of the community. The Old Testament requirement to love your neighbour as yourself should be understood as a requirement to accept your fellow tribesman as an equal, identical to yourself, "one of your own", with equal rights in the community. This principle also implies equal and open public interaction between members of the community, the rational combination of efforts to achieve the common good, mutual trust (as in oneself) and mutual guarantee (confidence, as in oneself) — the principle of solidarity. According to this formula, a member of the community is not considered an "alien" or "other". This is a very important point. Because in the psychology of human and social cruelty, the category of "alien" has a deep meaning and biological roots.

Clearly, the fundamental principle of many religious and philosophical teachings that society evolves through the moral education and development of individuals rather than society as a whole has become ineffective and has turned into an ethical trap where individuals form an immoral community.

The natural law of natural selection, expressed in the form of competition for territory and resources within species (intraspecific competition), has evolved from being the "driver" of progress in conditions of depleted free, undeveloped territories and high technological

and communicative development, to becoming a real existential threat to humanity as a biological species and civilisation.

In the context of globalisation and the growing pace and volume of information exchange and cultural and economic interaction, humanity is becoming an interconnected organism. Its parts and organs cannot compete with each other without endangering the common planetary existence.

Without free communication and open discussion at the global level, and with the preservation of an outdated model of social order inherited from the animal world, without the supremacy of global spiritual principles of interaction, society inevitably turns to the irrational animal, instinctive (according to C. Lorenz) nature, turning into an "animal anonymous herd" united by rituals and guided by archetypes based on instincts (Lorenz, 2002, p. 47).

It can be argued that such an imaginary community consists of atomised individuals bound together by imposed identities, collective rituals and violence, an animal fear of "alien" (others), existential horror and aggressive ideology. It is a society with incorrect relationships.

Figuratively speaking, one could say that the biblical God and the devil, as people joke, are "cut from the same cloth", since they represent different types of connections between people in society. Our invisible connections are growing stronger as globalisation progresses and can change from irrational competition to rational solidarity at the will of our free conscious choice.

The famous Russian socialist philosopher P. Kropotkin rightly considered solidarity to be the main sign of civilisation (Kropotkin, 2007). Competitive

struggle, on the other hand, can be termed "de-civilisation" or savagery.

Consequently, to form correct relationships, we must understand the harmful nature of existing relationships and consciously transform them into positive, integrative ones. This is the biblical "freedom of choice" which does not and cannot exist in an animal environment governed by instinct.

The main task of law, as a social institution, is to regulate relations between people and organise their correct legal connections. Law has always originated from the spiritual traditions of peoples and has been based on fundamental spiritual principles expressed in sacred texts. These principles have served as a spiritual constitution for thousands of years. Accordingly, the purpose of these fundamental spiritual principles is to organise proper ("orthodox", "legal", "faithful") relations between people in society.

Sacred texts themselves are a universal regulator of social relations and an expression of divine law and the law of nature. Rejecting these principles has consequences: a return to individual and group models of archetypal, animal, instinctive behaviour; the "worship of the inner beast" as described in the Bible; and the extinction of humanity as a species.

Thus, we can resolve the long-standing debate among philosophers, sociologists and legal scholars concerning the criteria for classifying certain normative acts as genuine law. In its original and traditional sense, law should be considered as norms based on fundamental spiritual principles and aimed at creating correct, rational and integrative relationships between people in society. Anything that does not correspond to this approach can safely be called legislative arbitrariness or legalised

violence against the very spiritual essence of a man as the image of the Creator.

Full-fledged work with such basic institutions as the state and law, understanding that their genesis is inseparable from the evolution of the social order itself, inevitably leads us away from the analysis of specific relationships regulated by law, deeper into the realm of sociology and philosophy. Only there, by touching on the fundamentals, can we fully determine the direction of the transformation of society, law and the state.

When we talk about social order, the structure of society in its most general sense, we naturally mean its normative expression — the normative social order that enshrines the fundamental values and principles of society.

Amidst the diversity of features and characteristics of social order, modern legal science refers to law as its "most effective form" and "a means of effective organisation and sustainable development" (Savenkov, 2020, p. 410).

Here, we are closer than ever to the essence of law as a social institution. And the state, in the words of P. Bourdieu, is "the name that we give to the hidden, invisible principles — indicating a kind of *deus absconditus* of the social order" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 7).

Contemporary sociology rightly notes that such value orientations and principles are initially established and legitimised in phenomena such as religion and tradition (Parsons, 1971, pp. 9, 19).

Furthermore, given the current degree of globalisation of our communication sphere, we can safely assume the existence of a single planetary social order rather than different orders referred to as civilisations, which either

exist in most territories or are publicly declared by society and law as an achievable goal.

We must also consider the significant commonality of religious thought and traditions, particularly within traditional world religions, especially the Abrahamic ones.

Thus, it would be logical to assume that the normative social order should be based on the values and principles proclaimed by world religions and the traditions of peoples. This would reflect the natural will of the majority of the planet's population.

If our spiritual experience and traditions of communal democracy, as well as global humanistic culture and scientific thought, are based on rational principles of mutual assistance and integration, then why are the current social and normative social orders based on completely different biological principles of competition? How could this have happened?

Clearly, the ideal of social order as declared at the spiritual and cultural levels is opposed to the actual and normative order.

This contradiction is the root cause of the social crisis of our time and an existential threat to humanity.

Referring to the arguments presented in the previous chapters, we can conclude that such a gap between the ideal values and reality in the form of politics and markets is a consequence of the appropriation of sovereignty by organised groups that have clearly degenerated to the level of an irrational competitive biological programme.

By appropriating sovereignty along with the states, replacing the public sphere with its quasi-public clone, and actively using media rituals and ritual violence, an organised minority imposes a biologically competitive version of

social order on society, among others, by replacing the law with legislative arbitrariness, and forcibly enshrines this social order at the normative level, using the doctrine of positivism.

This was made possible by a "great delusion", the forceful transformation of society by the state, the destruction of genuine democracy, and, above all, secularisation, with genuine spirituality being replaced by ideology.

If a healthy majority of people were free to determine the necessary social order, it would obviously be different. This idea is confirmed once again by sociologists, who argue that a mature society shares the ideals and normative order imposed by the state, in fact, by an organised minority (Parsons, 1971, p. 19).

Accordingly, deviating from the outcome of the biological programme designed by nature itself, in the form of species extinction, is only possible through a change in the paradigm of social order and the consolidation of the spiritual principles of a new normative social order at the level of global law. This can only be achieved by reviving genuine democracy in the form of direct network democracy, replacing professional politics with public activism, and establishing spiritual principles and traditions as the fundamental principles and norms of a global constitution.

Until recently, this could have been considered an unattainable utopia. Today, networked technologies of freedom are giving society a chance to become a unified information community and to raise the voice of the healthy majority through the adoption of a declaration of global sovereignty and the establishment, by direct worldwide vote, of the highest level of law — a global constitution for the inhabited world.

CHAPTER VI.
SPIRITUAL LAW AND THE SOCIAL DOCTRINE OF THE CHURCH

The basic principles of the Old Testament can be summarised as follows:

- Love for one's neighbour as oneself (equality and acceptance of one's neighbour);
- Awe of the Creator or Reverence for the Creator (recognising nature and personality as the highest values);
- Faith (mutual trust and support, and a commitment to shared goals and ideals).

The principles of the New Testament directly follow from these principles:

- The principle of universal equality before God (justice and freedom);
- The principle of universal unity in God (global integration and rejection of imposed identities).

But what do these basic spiritual principles mean in a social and socio-normative terms?

The Social Teaching of the Church, the result of in-depth research by Roman Catholic theologians, can rightly be considered a prototype of a normative social order based on biblical spiritual principles and values.

In 2004, within the framework of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace and at the behest of Pope John Paul II, the Roman Catholic Church created a compendium of the social doctrine of the Catholic Church (Compendium, 2004). This compendium provides a complete overview of the fundamental framework of the doctrinal corpus of Catholic social teaching and was published with the aim of consolidating and organising the Church's social doctrine.

This fundamental scientific work brings together the study of the fundamental spiritual laws of social development as manifested in the Old and New Testaments, the writings of the Church Fathers and the encyclicals of Roman Catholic leaders.

It should be noted that the value of this document is enhanced by the fact that the spiritual principles of social regulation are not examined exclusively from the perspective of the Catholic faith, but are considered within the broader pan-Christian and even Abrahamic context of Old Testament teachings and Judaism. This lends the document a special universal and ecumenical significance.

The motto of this document is: "For a civilisation of love". It was presented by Cardinal Renato Martino, President of the Pontifical Council for Justice and Peace, on 2 April 2004. The document builds upon the encyclicals of John Paul II: *Laborem Exercens* ("Through Work"), *Sollicitudo Rei Socialis* ("The Social Concern") and *Centesimus Annus* ("The Hundredth Year"). In these encyclicals, John Paul II set out the social teaching of the Church, the foundations of which were laid by Pope Leo XIII in his 1891 encyclical *Rerum Novarum* ("New matters on Capital and Labor"). The Papal Council aimed to collect and unify all the Church's doctrines on society in a single document, which had been consistently developed in the messages of the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church over more than a hundred years.

The doctrine rests on three pillars: human dignity, solidarity and subsidiarity. I would add to these the principles of universal equality and care for the natural environment as God's creation, which reflect elements of ancient Jewish law and the Prophetic Books of the Old

Testament, as well as the teachings of Jesus Christ as set out in the New Testament.

What spiritual principles for regulating social relations can we draw from this fundamental study of the sacred texts conducted by Catholic theologians?

The study of Christian spiritual principles of social organisation is discussed in Chapter 3 of the Compendium (Compendium, 2004).

The chapter's central message is that dignity, brotherhood, and freedom are gifts bestowed upon us by God at creation. The text also aims to promote respect for human dignity and encourage communication, as well as demanding justice and peace for all humanity.

The Compendium also reveals the Church's view that injustice, inequality and violence are sinful acts.

The principle of subsidiarity, mutual responsibility and care is proposed as the basis for social interaction.

The Compendium considers the human person (rational person) to be the image of God, endowing them with the highest value as a result of creation in the image and likeness of the Creator (Compendium, 2004, Nos. 105, 108, 109).

"All of social life is an expression of its unmistakable protagonist: the human person. Human society is therefore the object of the social teaching of the Church since she is neither outside nor over and above socially united men, but exists exclusively in them and, therefore, for them" (Compendium, 2004, No. 106). At the same time, the social nature of the individual and their manifestations in communication are emphasised. Thus, it can be said that the Church's teaching concerns the relationship of people in society, the principles of proper relationship, and the means

of achieving it, with the ultimate aim of revealing the divine principle in man (Compendium, 2004, No. 110).

The supreme value of human life in the teaching gives rise to the principles of the highest priority, the universality and inalienability of human rights and freedoms.

The right of the individual to a natural identity based on sex is emphasised, as well as the equality of men and women's rights as full reflections of the one image of God (Compendium, 2004, No. 111).

This leads to the rejection of imposed identities and the respect of human dignity: "since all people have the same dignity as creatures made in his image and likeness," and "the Incarnation of the Son of God shows the equality of all people." This is "the ultimate foundation of the radical equality and brotherhood among all people, regardless of their race, nation, sex, origin, culture, or class" (Compendium, 2004, No. 144).

The principle of human dignity also implies fulfilment of the biblical commandment that prohibits taking human life under any circumstances and the right to life (Compendium, 2004, No. 112).

No. 113 of the Compendium establishes the principle of responsible dominion of the world by humanity. In support of this principle, the Church's teaching refers to the Old Testament (Torah) and the Book of Genesis, which prohibit "arbitrary and selfish exploitation" of creation (nature and human beings). This essentially correlates with the Old Testament principle of awe of the Creator (Compendium, 2004, No. 113).

The Compendium goes on to describe sinful acts expressed in separation from one's divine origin, division within society (imposing false identities), conflict between people and mutual aggression. Building on the concept

of "original sin", the Church teaches that sinful qualities are present in humans from birth, which is consistent with their association with the instinctive, egoistic part of human consciousness (Compendium, 2004, Nos. 116-118).

The Church's social teaching then introduces the concept of "sinful" social structures (social institutions), which, according to the Church, "feed on the consequences of sin." "These are rooted in personal sin and, therefore, are always connected to concrete acts of the individuals who commit them, consolidate them and make it difficult to remove them. It is thus that they grow stronger, spread and become sources of other sins, conditioning human conduct. These are obstacles and conditioning that go well beyond the actions and brief life span of the individual and interfere also in the process of the development of peoples, the delay and slow pace of which must be judged in this light. The actions and attitudes opposed to the will of God and the good of neighbour, as well as the structures arising from such behaviour, appear to fall into two categories today: 'on the one hand, the all-consuming desire for profit, and on the other, the thirst for power, with the intention of imposing one's will upon others.' In order to characterize better each of these attitudes, one can add the expression: 'at any price'" (Compendium, 2004, No. 119).

Thus, the Church, understanding sin as the artificial division and opposition of people, leading to mutual hatred and violence, as well as the establishment and preservation of unjust inequality and mutual exploitation through violence, identifies the social structures (institutions) that contribute to this and have an apparatus for violence (physical or economic coercion) as "sinful structures" (Compendium, 2004, No. 119).

It is not difficult to see that the political and economic structures, politics and markets that create the current social order fully correspond to these characteristics. Given their biological instinctive roots, we can speak of their innate (natural or "original sinful") origin.

The social teaching of the Church emphasises that "man has two different characteristics: he is a material being, linked to this world by his body, and he is a spiritual being, open to transcendence and to the discovery of 'more penetrating truths', thanks to his intellect, by which 'he shares in the light of the divine mind'" (Compendium, 2004, No. 129).

The teaching emphasises the dual nature of human beings as biological creatures endowed with irrational instincts and as rational (intelligent) beings possessed of reason.

This gives rise to man's inalienable right to spiritual development and understanding, and to freedom of communication. When "he (the human person) is open also to others, to the men and women of the world, because only insofar as he understands himself in reference to a 'thou' can he say 'I'. He comes out of himself, from the self-centred preservation of his own life, to enter into a relationship of dialogue and communion with others" (Compendium, 2004, No. 130).

The Church sees the realisation of personal freedom expressly in the appeal to rational spiritual principles and voluntary adherence to them rather than biological instincts (Compendium, 2004, No. 135), which "entails above all the requirement not only of simple respect on the part of others, especially political and social institutions and their leaders with regard to every man

and woman on the earth, but even more, this means that the primary commitment of each person towards others, and particularly of these same institutions, must be for the promotion and integral development of the person" (Compendium, 2004, No. 131). This means that "the person cannot be a means for carrying out economic, social or political projects imposed by some authority" (Compendium, 2004, No. 133). Respect for human dignity must therefore be obeyed. It is necessary to "consider every neighbour without exception as another self, taking into account first of all his life and the means necessary for living it with dignity. Every political, economic, social, scientific and cultural programme must be inspired by the awareness of the primacy of each human being over society" (Compendium, 2004, No. 132).

The principle of personal freedom, as set out in the social teaching of the Church, is closely linked to the moral and spiritual law of Holy Scripture. According to this law, "the exercise of freedom implies a reference to a natural moral law, of a universal character, that precedes and unites all rights and duties. The natural law is 'nothing other than the light of intellect infused within us by God. Thanks to this, we know what must be done and what must be avoided. This light or this law has been given by God to creation'. It consists in the participation in his eternal law, which is identified with God himself. This law is called 'natural' because the reason that promulgates it is proper to human nature. It is universal, it extends to all people insofar as it is established by reason. In its principal precepts, the divine and natural law is presented in the Decalogue and indicates the primary and essential norms regulating moral life" (Compendium, 2004, No. 140).

Thus, from the perspective of Holy Scripture and the Church, we see that natural law is rational and inherent in everyone from the beginning. It is expressed in the desire for rational interaction where one's neighbour is accepted as "equal and one's own". The commandments of the Decalogue also derive from this (Compendium, 2004, No. 140).

When discussing the "natural" rational law, the doctrine highlights its universality and immutability for all of humanity. It notes that "in the diversity of cultures, the natural law unites peoples, enjoining common principles. Although its application may require adaptations to the many different conditions of life according to place, time and circumstances, it remains immutable under the flux of ideas and customs and supports their progress" (Compendium, 2004, No. 141).

This implies the equality of all people before a universal, rational natural law and the supremacy of such a law over all other rules, norms and traditions.

Several provisions of social teaching speak of the "sociality" of the human personality as a natural property of creation. Consequently, the human right to freedom of association and communication, and ultimately globalisation, can be considered a spiritual principle of Sacred Scripture (Compendium, 2004, Nos. 149-151).

This is because the acceptance of every human being as himself, regardless of his characteristics and origin, when "this 'socialization' also expresses the natural tendency for the sake of attaining objectives that exceed individual capacities" (Compendium, 2004, No. 151), ultimately leads to global unity on the rational principles of natural law.

In general terms, the social teaching of the Church derives two instruments for regulating social relations from

Sacred Scripture. The first are human rights, which derive directly from the dignity of creation in the image of God. The second are the principles of social development and interaction, which derive from the postulates of Scripture.

According to the Church's teaching, the following rights are considered to be universal, natural, inviolable and inalienable, and must take precedence over any laws, regulations and traditions:

- The right to life (from conception to death). This implies protection not only from violent deprivation of life, but also the creation of decent living conditions and the opportunity for the full development of the individual;
- The right to religious (spiritual) freedom and independence from pressure by organisations or institutions; the right to creativity and freedom of opinion;
- The right to human dignity, which is the freedom to not commit immoral acts under coercion;
- The right to communicate (freedom to exchange information);
- The right to objective information and access to information;
- The right to association and "sociality" (community), and ultimately, the right to globalisation (global community);
- The right to democracy, where individuals and society are the source of law, power and social order;
- The right to natural (sexual) identity and protection from the imposition of identities (artificial division);
- The right to participate in work involving the use of the earth's resources and to earn a living for oneself and one's loved ones through this work;
- The right to fair and decent remuneration for hired labour;

- The right to rest at weekends and on public holidays;
- The right to freely establish a family and raise children;
- The right to social care for motherhood;
- The right to food;
- The right to a favourable environment;
- The right to peace;
- The right to housing;
- The right to freedom of movement;
- The right to healthcare (Compendium, 2004, Nos. 152-155).

These rights apply equally not only to individuals, but also to peoples and nations as social organisms, which have the right to:

- existence;
- self-determination;
- independence;
- their own language, culture and traditions;
- build their own future and ensure that the younger generation receives a proper education;
- living in peace with respect and solidarity towards other peoples and nations (Compendium, 2004, No. 157).

The main "permanent principles of the Church's social doctrine" — "the very heart of Catholic social teaching" — are:

- the principle of the dignity of the human person;
- the principle of the common good;
- the principle of subsidiarity;
- the principle of solidarity (Compendium, 2004, No. 160).

These basic principles should be considered together as they are interconnected and form a system. The doctrine reveals and details these principles in a multitude of particular principles derived from them.

The principle of the dignity of the human person was considered earlier in the context of the doctrine of natural human rights.

The next postulate is the principle of the common good.

The principle of the common good considers the progress of humanity within the framework of social collective action, when it is not "the simple sum of the particular goods of each subject of a social entity. Belonging to everyone and to each person, it is and remains 'common', because it is indivisible and because only together is it possible to attain it, increase it and safeguard its effectiveness, with regard also to the future" (Compendium, 2004, No. 164). The common good is achieved through the voluntary and rational union of society's forces to attain the "social and communal dimension of moral good," because "a society that wishes and intends to remain at the service of the human being at every level is a society that has the common good — the good of all people" (Compendium, 2004, No. 165).

Once again, we encounter the spiritual principle of the rational union of society's forces within a single community for the joint conquest of the future. This is in direct opposition to biological selection based on irrational struggles for survival, selfishness and individualism.

According to the logic of the teaching, "this goal-setting principle gives rise to requirements for commitment to peace, the organization of the State's powers, a sound juridical system, the protection of the environment, and the provision of essential services to all, some of which are at the same time human rights: food, housing, work, education and access to culture, transportation, basic health care, the freedom of communication and expression, and the protection of religious freedom" (Compendium, 2004, No.

166). According to this principle, "everyone also has the right to enjoy the conditions of social life that are brought about by the quest for the common good" (Compendium, 2004, No. 167).

The following principles follow from this, according to the logic of the document:

- the universal destination of goods (earthly and cosmic resources);

- the universal right to use goods (earthly and cosmic resources).

The Church proceeds from the premise that all goods and resources, whether soil, mineral or other resources, minerals and climatic advantages, are given by the Creator to all humanity in equal measure, when "God destined the earth and all it contains for all men and all peoples, so that all created things would be shared fairly by all mankind under the guidance of justice tempered by charity" (Compendium, 2004, No. 171). Accordingly, social teaching requires that ownership of the goods be equally accessible to all, so that everyone becomes an owner to some extent, at least. Clearly, this refers to the global socialisation of natural resources, which would require appropriate global legislation and a system of transnational governance.

These fundamental principles of spiritual justice directly contradict the established political and economic order, which is based on collective egoism, the violent appropriation and retention of natural resources by interested groups as a continuation of natural selection and the struggle for survival in the social sphere, and the violent preservation of inequality.

P. Bourdieu speaks of such appropriation: "There are proprietors — those whom I call the present-day state

nobility — who effect an appropriation, a patrimonialization of the public" (Bourdieu, 2014, p. 293).

We refer here to the biblical understanding of sin as an instrument of division and violent inequality, as well as the unjust, violent appropriation and retention of common goods (resources).

Supporters of the status quo may view the concept of global socialisation and the distribution of natural wealth as unjust because it violates the rights of individual states and peoples to their "ancestral habitat". However, it must be understood that the ancestral habitat is often the result of wars and historical violence.

Furthermore, national pride in possessing "national wealth" ignores the actual appropriation of such resources by ruling elites who have seized power in their countries and the transfer of ownership to global oligarchic power in the form of transnational economic structures.

Formal separation from the "illusion of ownership" in creating a global, fair mechanism for distributing natural resources would give every inhabitant of the planet a real share in using natural resources, fairly equalize socio-economic situations and living standards for the common good and development, and renounce violence.

The result of such transformations will inevitably be a reduction in international tensions, poverty and labour migration, which, in a situation of global competition and markets, are caused by large differences in wages and incomes in different regions of the world. Such differences are achievable both through collusion among employers (often globalised) and through speculation with national currencies on international exchanges.

The Church recognizes that "looking after the common good means making use of the new opportunities for the redistribution of wealth among the different areas of the planet, to the benefit of the underprivileged that until now have been excluded or cast to the sidelines of social and economic progress. The challenge, in short, is to ensure a globalization in solidarity, a globalization without marginalization" (Compendium, 2004, No. 363).

Clearly, the only way to counteract this injustice is through a global currency and a global system of workers' unity and global trade unions which, according to the Church, are "promoters of the struggle for social justice" (Compendium, 2004, No. 306).

It should be noted that quasi-public spheres of appropriated states actively speculate with concepts of national interests and the protection of citizens' rights, creating an illusion of ownership and rights. In reality, the majority of the world's population is in a situation no better than that of slaves in ancient empires. There, rights are merely declarative, and property is not adequately protected. Thus, anyone, at any moment, can be deprived not only of their property and freedom, but also of their very life, at the whim of those in power.

In these circumstances, establishing the supremacy of global law based on spiritual principles through the realisation of the right to popular sovereignty by the world's population via direct electronic democracy is not only a way of establishing proper relations in society, but also an opportunity for the population to gain real rights and freedoms.

According to the Church, the concept of a universal right to use goods in modern society presupposes universal free

access to the results of scientific and technological progress, such as scientific discoveries, technologies, and means of communication and data transmission (Compendium, 2004, No. 179). This means guaranteeing the freedom of the Internet as a means of communication and globalisation and creating a mechanism for redeeming and socialising the results of scientific work necessary for all of humanity, such as technologies for producing essential medicines, vaccines, and food.

Progress is genuine only when technological development contributes to overall development rather than increased competition, domination, and oppression. This depends on who controls the results of scientific activity. The importance of this issue is dictated by the existential threat that today's scientific achievements pose to humanity if they fall into the wrong hands.

Such tasks cannot be solved through ordinary international cooperation due to international competition in markets. We must establish global, transnational management structures with the necessary resources and authority based on global law.

The Church's teaching assumes that "the principle of the universal destination of goods is an invitation to develop an economic vision inspired by moral values that permit people not to lose sight of the origin or purpose of these goods, so as to bring about a world of fairness and solidarity, in which the creation of wealth can take on a positive function" (Compendium, 2004, No. 174).

Based on this principle, the teaching suggests prioritising public and community forms of resource ownership over private property, and viewing the social character of any economy as its primary function.

The teaching identifies subsidiarity as the next basic spiritual principle of social organisation.

The teaching says that "on the basis of this principle, all societies of a superior order must adopt attitudes of help ('*subsidium*') — therefore of support, promotion, development — with respect to lower-order societies. In this way, intermediate social entities can properly perform the functions that fall to them without being required to hand them over unjustly to other social entities of a higher level, by which they would end up being absorbed and substituted, in the end seeing themselves denied their dignity and essential place" (Compendium, 2004, No. 186).

This spiritual principle's essence lies in counteracting the natural processes of centralisation when the accumulation of power and resources at a higher (state or transnational) level absorbs local communities, economies, and cultures.

In the context of the globalisation of all spheres of public life, there is an alternative to rigid centralisation (superstate) in the form of transferring part of sovereignty to the global level of transnational governance with the widespread development of local initiatives in the form of non-governmental organisations and activist movements — global self-government.

While it is impossible to return to the past, choosing the right path will determine whether the world becomes a huge corporation (a corporate state) subordinated to elites' pursuit of profit through inequality or a harmonious community of communities striving for common progress and peace.

The principle of participation derives from the principle of subsidiarity.

According to doctrine, "the characteristic implication of subsidiarity is participation, which is expressed essentially in a series of activities by means of which the citizen, either as an individual or in association with others, whether directly or through representation, contributes to the cultural, economic, political and social life of the civil community to which he belongs" (Compendium, 2004, No. 189). Clearly, this refers to the involvement and activism inherent in the new global network community.

A clear example of the implementation of this principle are national and supranational activist movements united by common goals and connected by a global network to protect human rights and freedoms, minority rights, or preserve a favourable environment. Such movements are based on the selfless desire of people around the world to create a just global society, without a rigid hierarchy or payment for the actions of participants. In essence, they are as close as possible to associations of believers of world religions and are the prototype of actors in the global public sphere of the future.

Activism is opposed to politics — the professional activities of lobbyists controlled by the financial elite. Modern politics has become a tool for manipulating society through financing election campaigns, populism, voter bribery, and the creation of a quasi-public broadcast media sphere controlled by the financial and political elite. The phenomenon of auditorium democracy (or mediacracy) in the context of professional politics steadily reduces public involvement in decision-making on common issues, replacing the political process with collective media rituals and bureaucracy (administrative rituals).

All of this contributes to the transfer of sovereignty to a transnational oligarchy that has merged with the deep state to form a global oligarchic power.

The only thing that can counter this for the sake of reviving genuine democracy and sovereignty is the spiritual principle of universal participation (universal involvement) proclaimed by the Church on the basis of Holy Scripture.

The Church's teachings identify solidarity as the fundamental spiritual principle of social development.

According to the teaching, "solidarity highlights in a particular way the intrinsic social nature of the human person, the equality of all in dignity and rights and the common path of individuals and peoples towards an ever more committed unity" (Compendium, 2004, p. 192).

In conditions of increasing connectivity, for the first time in human history, thanks to social media globalisation, the global network has provided the technical possibility for interaction and dialogue within the global community (the public sphere, according to J. Habermas) (Habermas, 1989) and the formation of a global civil society. This is particularly important when, in parallel with these processes, transnational corporations are stratifying the planet's territories into "first", "second", and "third world" countries as part of industrial and financial globalisation, and global exploitation and socio-economic inequality are on the rise.

The only thing that can counteract the transformation of the world into a corporation and a totalitarian superstate is the will of the world's population, united by the principle of mutual acceptance and a natural desire for peace, justice and freedom.

A paradigm dramatic shift is required in social relations, moving away from irrational (animalistic) competition,

struggle for resources and mutual exploitation, towards a truly human, rational (spiritual) union based on equality, mutual acceptance and the greatness of a common goal: development and connection into a global community, the "Civilisation the Creator".

Today, this has become possible thanks to social media globalisation, activism, and the near-future acceptance by all in the perspective of everyone of the highest level of global law — a global constitution — as a manifestation of the sovereign will of the spiritually healthy world majority, through direct global electronic democracy.

The Church notes that "national sovereignty is not, however, absolute. Nations can freely renounce the exercise of some of their rights in view of a common goal in the awareness that they form a 'family of nations'" (Compendium, 2004, No. 435).

At the same time, spiritual principles must have the force of supreme global law, "to bring about and consolidate an international order that effectively guarantees peaceful mutual relations among peoples, the same moral law that governs the life of men must also regulate relations among States" (Compendium, 2004, No. 436). The Church confirms this by saying that "universal respect of the principles underlying 'a legal structure in conformity with the moral order' is a necessary condition for the stability of international life. The quest for such stability has led to the gradual elaboration of a 'right of nations' ('*ius gentium*'), which can be considered as 'the ancestor of international law'. Juridical and theological reflection, firmly based on natural law, has formulated 'universal principles which are prior to and superior to the internal law of States'" (Compendium, 2004, No. 437).

Church teaching describes a global revolution in consciousness, when "the new relationships of interdependence between individuals and peoples, which are de facto forms of solidarity, have to be transformed into relationships tending towards genuine ethical-social solidarity. This is a moral requirement inherent in all human relationships. Solidarity is therefore seen under two complementary aspects: as a social principle and as a moral virtue. Above all, solidarity must be seen in its value as a moral virtue that determines the order of institutions. Based on this principle, the 'structures of sin' that dominate relationships between individuals and peoples must be overcome. They must be purified and transformed into structures of solidarity through the creation or appropriate modification of laws, market regulations, and juridical systems" (Compendium, 2004, No. 193).

In a certain sense, it is the idea of solidarity that is the social expression of the highest spiritual law of love for one’s neighbour, on the basis of which, and connected with which, the common spiritual future of humanity as a civilisation can only be realised.

The teaching rightly notes, the "social doctrine regarding solidarity clearly shows that there exists an intimate bond between solidarity and the common good, between solidarity and the universal destination of goods, between solidarity and equality among men and peoples, between solidarity and peace in the world" (Compendium, 2004, No. 194).

It should be noted that peace between nations is viewed by the doctrine as a direct consequence of solidarity and justice, that is, love and righteousness, harmonised in spiritual law.

Clearly, such a law must possess characteristics of supremacy, stability, universality, and unity of interpretation on a global scale.

Along with rights and principles, the teachings of the Church proclaim also the fundamental values (ideals) of social life in a harmonious spiritual society, genuine traditional and spiritual values.

These are:

- truth;
- freedom;
- justice;
- love;
- peace.

Unfortunately, social teaching itself does not define truth in a social context, only mentioning the importance of striving for it (Compendium, 2004, No. 198).

In philosophy, truth is typically defined as a judgment that corresponds to reality independent of the knowing subject. This brings to mind the famous philosopher G. Pomerantz's words that "the devil begins with the foam on the lips of an angel who has entered the battle for good, for truth, for justice..." (Pomerantz, 2011).

Given the variety of scientific and cognitive approaches, it is clear that this concept will remain relative for a long time.

In the public sphere, it would be more correct to speak of sincerity and publicity (openness) in relations between people, which is more in line with the popular term "truth". It is precisely the public, open nature of communication and the sincerity of its participants that are the guarantee of mutual trust in society, according to the teaching (Compendium, 2004, No. 439).

In turn, trust is the best safeguard against any conflicts, a guarantee of peace, along with justice and solidarity. Charles Tilly says in *Democracy* that "trust, then, consists of placing valued outcomes at risk to others' malfeasance, mistakes, or failures. Trust relationships include those in which people regularly take such risks" (Tilly, 2007, p. 81).

We must not forget that the foundation of any community democracy is based on sincerity and open discussion when resolving common issues. This advantageously distinguishes it from politics, where deliberately false messages and conclusions are often used to manipulate public opinion. According to the Church, "in the world of the media the intrinsic difficulties of communications are often exacerbated by ideology, the desire for profit and political control, rivalry and conflicts between groups" (Compendium, 2004, No. 416).

In his work *Democracy*, Charles Tilly rightly spoke of trust (mutual acceptance) between people as the basis of natural democracy in a community. He described the breakdown of community as a process of "de-democratisation", which "occurs chiefly as a consequence of withdrawal by privileged, powerful political actors from whatever mutually binding consultation exists, whereas democratization depends on integrating large numbers of ordinary people into consultation. In more complex terms, privileged, powerful elites such as large landlords, industrialists, financiers, and professionals have much greater means and incentives than ordinary people to escape or subvert democratic com pacts when those compacts turn to their disadvantage" (Tilly, 2007, p. 195). Put simply, true democracy is equal public dialogue.

There is an obvious natural contrast between the truth-guaranteeing publicity of communal democracy and modern politics, with its confidentiality and secrecy of "deals behind the backs of society," which is so close to the biblical concepts of the Saviour as "the way, the truth, and the life" (New Testament, John 14:6) and the devil, in whom "there is no truth ... for he is a liar and the father of lies" (New Testament, John 8:44).

The teaching names freedom as an unconditional social value.

The Church understands freedom as the absence of coercion to evil on the part of "sinful" social institutions, "as the capacity to be in possession of oneself in view of the genuine good, within the context of the universal common good" (Compendium, 2004, No. 200). One cannot but agree with this. It is evident that this refers to the possibility of choosing between biological instincts at the personal or social level and rational moral behaviour inherent in humans.

The teaching also names justice as an unconditional value.

In the context of the teaching, justice is the highest natural need of a spiritual being for harmony and balance in their relationships with the world. This need is expressed through the concept of duty, which requires conformity between action and reward. In his world-famous work *A Theory of Justice*, John Rawls defines justice through the equality of freedoms and opportunities in society (Rawls, 1971). The "gene" of justice is an innate "particle of God" that resides in every human being from birth, regardless of their upbringing or social environment. This is something that cannot be found in other creatures or in the animal world. This is confirmed by geneticists, who state that "there is

reason to believe that there is something inherent in human nature that eternally draws us to justice, to heroic deeds and to self-sacrifice. The enormous, albeit contradictory, potential for doing good that is constantly revealed in humans also has its roots in their hereditary nature. This is embedded by special biological factors that played a significant role in the mechanisms of natural selection in the evolution of our ancestors" (Efroimson,1971).

There is every reason to believe that, alongside peace, justice is a fundamental human need, as the absence of justice can prompt voluntary deprivation and conscious self-sacrifice, forcing individuals to transcend basic needs. Without the inclusion of the need for justice, Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" is deprived of its true foundation (Maslow, 1954).

Speaking of law as an expression of the "categorical imperative", I. Kant wrote, "For if justice disappears, human life on earth will no longer have any value" (Kant, 1965*a*, Vol. 4, Part II, p. 256).

Social teaching of the Church primarily focuses on social and international justice, the result of which, alongside solidarity, is the achievement of eternal peace. Is this what Immanuel Kant is telling us?

The social teachings of the Church place particular emphasis on the value of love.

Starting with the Old Testament (Torah), the principle of love is central to the Covenant and divine law. In social terms, this means accepting every person as "one's own", as similar and equal to oneself.

And peace, as a value, is derived from love and justice.

The teaching proclaims peace as a complete world order organised in accordance with the highest moral and spiritual law, or global law.

According to the Church, "peace is a value and a universal duty founded on a rational and moral order of society that has its roots in God himself, 'the first source of being, the essential truth and the supreme good'. Peace is not merely the absence of war, nor can it be reduced solely to the maintenance of a balance of power between enemies. Rather it is founded on a correct understanding of the human person and requires the establishment of an order based on justice and charity" (Compendium, 2004, No. 494).

This social ideal is of great importance, since the life and future of humanity depend on it in modern conditions.

The teachings of the Church also promote the principle of reverence for the environment as part of creation and the Creator's Spirit that permeates it. In addition to the Compendium, this spiritual principle is addressed in the encyclical *LAUDATO SI'* (Latin for "Praise be to You" or "On Care for Our Common Home") by Pope Francis, Head of the Catholic Church, who has made an invaluable contribution to the creation of a global spiritual community. This encyclical addresses the existential challenge of our time: the destruction of the environment and the human habitat by human beings.

The purpose of this message to the world is to expand upon the Church's social teaching in the ecological sphere (Francis, 2015, Encyclical 15).

The Church sees the source of the barbaric exploitation of natural resources in "man's pretension of exercising unconditional dominion over things, heedless of any moral considerations which, on the contrary, must distinguish all human activity" (Compendium, 2004, No. 461).

According to the Church, humanity's growing ability to change the world has led to an understanding of nature as a

"resource base" for our plans, which has critically disrupted the balance between man and the environment (Francis, 2015, Encyclical 23).

The Church proposes that the environment and climate be considered a "collective good", the preservation of which is "a challenge for all of humanity. It is a matter of a common and universal duty, that of respecting a common good" (Compendium, 2004, No. 466; Francis, 2015, Encyclical 23).

Similarly, it is proposed that all natural resources should be treated as objects of shared rational use, rather than as commodities (Compendium, 2004, No. 485).

Francis's encyclical explicitly refers to the origins of the "spiral of self-destruction" rooted in collective selfishness in the struggle and wars over the planet's dwindling resources (Francis, 2015, Encyclicals, 57, 163, 204).

This situation can rightly be considered a trigger for the extinction of humanity, which has depleted its own habitat through intraspecific competition and is entering into a final battle with itself for the remaining resources and habitable territories. Humanity is seeking to destroy its own kind in order to eliminate competitors in the struggle for survival. How does this differ from the extinction of previously dominant biological species that followed a similar bioprogramme?

The only way to counteract this mechanism of self-destruction (extinction) is through the rational unification of humanity based on spiritual principles of responsible attitude towards the environment, sources of life, and ourselves. This would unite all reasonable aspirations in the name of the common good and progress of humanity.

Undoubtedly, "responsibility for the environment should also find adequate expression on a juridical level. It is important that the international community draw up uniform rules" (Compendium, 2004, No. 468).

In his encyclical, Francis rightly notes the inability of politics that is "concerned with immediate results, supported by consumerist sectors of the population, is driven to produce short-term growth," as well as restrained by collective egoism at the national level, to achieve this task (Francis, 2015, Encyclical 178).

The current competitive economic model (markets) is an expression of selfishness and consumerism, and without changing it as a paradigm of development and its goals, there is no future. Francis says directly that "there is a need to change 'models of global development'; this will entail a responsible reflection on 'the meaning of the economy and its goals with an eye to correcting its malfunctions and misapplications'. It is not enough to balance, in the medium term, the protection of nature with financial gain, or the preservation of the environment with progress. Halfway measures simply delay the inevitable disaster. Put simply, it is a matter of redefining our notion of progress" (Francis, 2015, Encyclical 194).

Thus, against the backdrop of a shift from an irrational competitive paradigm of development to universal rational integration, the spiritual principle of environmental conservation and the rational use of resources as a common good becomes a condition for averting the prospect of the extinction of humanity as a species.

Rethinking the competitive market paradigm and rejecting essential capitalism as an expression of the biological programme of natural selection in the socio-

economic sphere is a prerequisite for the survival of humanity.

Over time, the role of capital as a measure of social recognition and success will also need to be reconsidered. Capital itself should be viewed not only in terms of its size, but also its source, as has always been the case in traditional societies. In modern China, a large-scale social experiment is underway to assign citizens a social rating (credit). Perhaps something similar will be needed in future global societies, but not in relation to people themselves — which would undoubtedly be a form of discrimination — but rather in relation to their income, when the rewards received for contributions to social development, helping others, and civic initiatives are valued more highly by society than income from speculative transactions or cryptocurrency mining. The important thing is that these criteria must be uniform and transparent, based on spiritual principles and the will of the global community as a whole, and enshrined in global legal norms. Otherwise, if left in the hands of individual regimes and states, this could become a tool for manipulating society and restricting human rights and freedoms in the financial sphere.

Islam became a later world traditional religion that emerged from the Abrahamic tradition. The sacred text of this teaching is the Koran, which establishes the basic spiritual principles of social organisation.

Experts in the social ethics of Islam note that "Islam is characterised by a close connection between religious faith and moral approval: morality is an integral part of faith, and faith is a way of morally responsible existence in the world" (Pakhravova, 2009).

Thus, the teachings of Islam are directly aimed at regulating relations in society and represent the basis of traditional law, when "Faith is a force that protects people from bad deeds and encourages people to do noble deeds. According to the Muslim tradition, faith ('iman') consists of three elements: inner perception ('tasdiq'), professing the word ('ikrar') and doing good deeds ('amal'). Faith must be combined with virtue ('ihsan'), which forms religion ('din'), a code of actions of a believer that receives an appropriate moral assessment" (Pakhravova, 2009).

The ethical system of Islam itself is aimed at evaluating people's actions or inactions in specific relationships (interrelationships between them), where "good and evil are interpreted relatively. A certain action (e.g., gambling) may be designated as evil not in an absolute sense, but only because the good it brings (mental pleasure) is outweighed by the evil (possible loss, ruin). In ethics, as in legal theory, the assessment of the situation plays an important role: what is forbidden and evil in one case may be obligatory and good in another" (Pakhravova, 2009).

The central point of Islamic ethics is the question of freedom of choice between good ("hayr") and evil ("shar"), based on the rational justification of striving for the common good (the principle of the common good, which we are already familiar with). Islamic theology asserts that "reason is the basis of true freedom, for it inclines towards good and removes evil, directing the will towards the realisation of justice, known and accepted by humans as the highest goal in life" (Pakhravova, 2009).

Once again, we see the priority of rational choice for the common good and justice as the highest goal. It should be noted that justice is regarded by the Koran as

an expression of the common good and the highest social value. "In the Koran, 'adl' (justice, decency) is seen as one of Allah's qualities, and he rewards both good and evil in equal measure. The Holy Book obliges us to observe justice in all things," note researchers (Pakhravova, 2009).

The specific expression of the rules of social behaviour is found in traditional Muslim law, or "shariat", which "addresses both secular and religious issues from an Islamic perspective. It brings together the laws governing economic life, moral norms, Muslim rites and holidays into a single system, determining the behaviour of believers and the order of life of the entire Muslim community" (Pakhravova, 2009).

Islamic religious law, like the teaching itself, is supranational and global in nature, based on the idea of building supranational relations of mutual acceptance of neighbours on the basis of faith, universal justice and unity in God.

This principle of divine unity ("tawhid") serves as an expression of the Abrahamic principle of mutual acceptance and global identity in the Koran, offering an alternative to indulging in animal passions that divide people. The realisation of this basic spiritual principle is the foundation of the teaching's goal: the achievement of a universal global identity of humanity.

It should be noted that, as the youngest Abrahamic religion, which took shape in the Middle Ages, Islam, like other religions, was significantly influenced by the political and economic system that divided peoples. However, this did not prevent it from preserving the most important spiritual globalising principles, consistent with the basic Abrahamic spiritual principles, which make its followers members of the great Abrahamic spiritual brotherhood.

For the Abrahamic religions, the universal source of spiritual principles for society is the Torah of Moses (the Old Testament), whose principles of love for one's neighbour, faith, and reverence (care) have been developed within religious traditions.

The main direction of development of the basic spiritual principle of love for one's neighbour through accepting them as oneself (mutual acceptance) and rejecting personal animal egoism became the spiritual principle of the New Testament about the unity of human identity in the image of God, which implies the rejection of imposed identities (artificial division) based on the principle of animal group (herd) egoism.

Figuratively speaking, all sacred texts call for the triumph of the spiritual, or divine, rational "gene" of solidarity over the irrational, biological "gene" of competition inherent in nature itself.

The division of humanity along national, state or ideological lines — aptly termed by B. Anderson as "imagined communities" (Anderson, 1991, pp. 5-6) — forms the basis of the political system used by elites who have appropriated the state to manipulate society.

Collective egoism, as a continuation of evolutionary natural selection through collective rituals, appeals to the irrational archetype of an animal pack defending its living space and expanding it at the expense of "other" ("foreign") communities.

In this case, within the framework of an "imaginary community" or "illusory community" (artificial identity), according to K. Marx (Marx, Engels, 1955, p. 32), the principle of mutual acceptance can be realised within the community. Meanwhile, irrational animal aggression and

egoism, reinforced by the union many times over, are directed against "foreign" communities and their members, who in this construct are perceived as an existential threat and a legitimate victim of intraspecies competition.

This approach, born of the "divide and rule" principle of "pleonexers", easily explains the origins of collective aggression and unparalleled cruelty in wars between seemingly civilised and spiritually developed peoples. Appealing to the collective irrational archetypal principle creates conditions for the phenomenon of collective degradation of society, collective degeneration (return) to a pre-moral and pre-law level.

Clearly, such an archetypal form of social order, with its multiplied power, triggers a destructive bioprogramme of intraspecific struggle at an international level. Alongside the exponential growth of scientific and technological progress, the barbaric extraction of resources from the environment, its subsequent pollution and the irrational expenditure of societal energy on mutual hostility, this social order is leading humanity, as a biological species, to extinction — the final stage in the evolution of any biological species that has ever dominated the planet.

In the immortal teachings of Christ and the Apostles, however, this existential threat is countered by the principle of a global human identity centred on the worship of a single Creator, and by unity through shared spiritual principles and a common future.

Against the backdrop of strengthening global connectivity and the growth of forces and energies generated by such connections, the need to realise a single global human identity is becoming increasingly relevant. The power of global connectivity can be compared to an

electric current in a circuit: when it flows correctly, it is capable of performing useful work; when the circuit is short-circuited, however, the energy is directed towards destruction. Is this not what happens to peoples bound by aggressive, competitive ties who embark on the path of war and mutual destruction?

Being bound by increasingly powerful "incorrect" repulsive connections, like magnets, we are capable, on the basis of free choice — the main spiritual principle of love as mutual acceptance — of consciously changing the "polarity" of our connections (reversing it) to mutual attraction, uniting in the name of the common good (the good of all in the perspective of everyone), then the power of our common "field" of love and trust, our intelligent and creative energy, will reach its maximum — of the Civilisation the Creator.

If we summarise all of humanity's spiritual heritage, as expressed in its religions, culture, traditions, and sacred texts, it becomes clear that all of this is a call for the reasonable (rational) unification of humanity's forces for the sake of common survival and development, contrary to the biological, irrational, egoistic instincts inherited from our animal ancestors (the "inner beast") that lead us to destruction. Our entire history is a choice between unifying rational and divisive irrational connections in society, both on a personal and collective level, the essence of which is the unifying force manifested between us in different qualities, such as "+" or "–", life or death, God or the devil.

Our special position as creatures similar to the Creator, endowed with His Mind, gives us the right to choose the vector of such connecting forces, the freedom of choice that determines our personal destiny and prospects between

resembling the Creator or animals, and our common destiny and prospects between a great space civilisation or another extinct biological species.

Modern science explains the struggle between these alternatives in individual and collective consciousness in terms of our physiology. In the words of R. Ardrey, it is a conflict between the limbic system ("old brain") and the neocortex in our brain. The neocortex "speaks in a language that the old brain does not understand", and "through moods and emotions the old brain can communicate with the new ... for it is precisely the equivalent of talking to animals" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 369). "And that is why, for example, we may understand perfectly the cause of a psychosomatic affliction and just as perfectly be unable to do anything about it. We act against our best judgment, let our worst impulses get the better of us, plead that somehow or other we could not control ourselves" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 369). From a psychological point of view, this is a struggle between the conscious and the unconscious, the rational and the irrational; from a spiritual point of view, it is a struggle between Light and darkness. In biblical eschatology, perhaps this is our "Armageddon" for choosing a common global perspective: life or death, future or oblivion.

CHAPTER VII.
GLOBAL LAW AND SPIRITUAL SOCIAL ORDER

Throughout history, it has become clear that politicians are incapable of constructive interaction due to the inherently selfish and competitive nature of politics as a struggle for survival, resources, and territory. In these conditions, the only real force for global progress is a popular initiative based on social media, globalisation and popular diplomacy.

This is possible because basic values are inherent in any healthy society and are manifested in the will of the majority of people. This moral principle is inherent in every human being from birth, regardless of nationality or upbringing, and is the foremost proof of the divine presence in the world.

The Holy Scriptures refer to the Lord, with his doctrine of mutual love and unity in God, as "the way" and "the life", whereas the devil is referred to as "the son of perdition". If we consider the biblical devil, the evil selfish beginning as a biological programme of natural selection embedded in us by evolution — competition for living space, food and reproduction — then it becomes obvious that following such a bioprogramme will lead humanity to the same end as all the species that previously dominated the planet: extinction due to the depletion of resources and mutual destruction in the struggle for their remains.

This provides an answer to futurologists' question about whether a highly developed space civilisation based on competition and mutual aggression, similar to modern politics and markets, could exist. The answer is obvious. It cannot exist, as it will inevitably come to self-destruction and

self-annihilation, and extinction. In order to achieve the level of a developed extraplanetary civilisation, it is necessary to adhere to the principles of global rational unification for the sake of shared development and prosperity goals. What is it but the realisation of the fundamental spiritual principle of loving one's neighbour, unity, and mutual assistance. We can assume that the very ability of civilisation to overcome the animal bioprogramme and the transition to a rational integral system of relations in society are peculiar criteria for its viability on a universal scale. A civilisation can only be considered as established when rational principles prevail over irrational animal instincts. Otherwise, a severe selection takes place and the civilisation inevitably dies out without leaving the planet of its origin.

From this, it becomes obvious that the biological programme of competition and struggle for survival is destructive, irrational and instinctive, whereas cooperation and unification embody a rational and intelligent principle that is unique to humans who are endowed with reason.

Hence, the biblical status of Christ as the Redeemer of "animalistic" sins, the Savior of the world, and the Liberator from the prison of our personal and collective archetypes through mutual acceptance and unification for the sake of survival and development is clear.

For a globalised, interconnected post-industrial society, the old social order based on political and market competition — copied and transposed to the social level by the principle of evolutionary selection (bioprogramme) — is a real existential threat.

Initially, when the planet's population was small, strong connections were not in place, and conflicts were localised. Due to the low level of technology, these conflicts

did not threaten the mass destruction of the human species or irreparable ecological damage to the planet. Thus, the principle of natural selection and intraspecies competition successfully coped with the task of stimulating extensive socioeconomic development.

The propagators of this world order in ancient times were military leaders and elites. The natural form of organisation of ancient society was the community based on equality, openness, mutual support and respect (mutual surety), which followed traditional and religious principles of dwelling, and was governed by direct community public democracy at assemblies and meetings with open public voting and discussion.

A turning point in human development was the global migration of peoples caused by powerful ecological shifts and changes in the Earth's climate.

Under these conditions, people were forced to compete for biological resources and defend their habitats from raids by barbarians. The original folk militias, consisting of ordinary community members, could no longer fully cope with such a task due to their lack of professional military skills and inability to permanently divert their attention from their main activities. Thus, the practice of hiring military units to protect tribes emerged.

These independent troops were usually made up of aggressive and violent people who were often expelled from tribal communities for committing crimes or disrespecting society and its traditions. These outcasts formed criminal communities that engaged in robbery and mercenary activities. They were characterised by animal aggression, a propensity for violence, and a thirst for unbridled wealth acquisition. They often came from the least developed

part of society — barbarian tribes — and were hired by more developed communities to protect them. In the face of military threats, these "defenders" were granted extraordinary powers by the communities to organise defence and govern.

T. Parsons describes this process as follows: "Provision for sheer physical security was probably the most pressing practical problem of the time. Beside the original 'barbarian' invasion of the Empire, disorder throve on long-continuing incursions (for example, by the Muslims on the east and south, Huns on the east and north, and Scandinavians on the north and west) and constant internecine strife induced by political fragmentation. A premium was thus placed on the military function, the basis of protection being military safeguards against violence. With strong support from the traditions of antiquity, a predominantly military class became ascendant in secular society and secured its position through the hierarchical institution of vassalage" (Parsons, 1971, p. 37).

Abusing power and available forceful resources, such mercenary military leaders soon appropriated authority over communities and, together with their vigilantes, turned into sole rulers — feudal lords.

This explains the shift from democracy and spiritual traditions to one-person rule and mutual exploitation in the Middle Ages.

Thus, organised groups inclined toward irrational, competitive, animal-like thinking managed to seize political power and convert it into economic power. The social order they built for their own interests turned out to be a reflection of their inner biological irrationality and an imitation of the animal intraspecies struggle. Robert Ardrey points out in

this regard, "Man indeed was born yesterday. Social order is contained in our animal past and is ingrained in the patterns of our animal sub-brains" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 372).

The first proto-states — the empires that grew out of violence and conquest — became a vivid expression of this system. The main principle of their formation was the Roman principle of "divide and conquer", in which peoples were not supposed to unite and recognise each other's value and equality, but rather, suppress and oppress others through violence, turning the empire into a "prison of peoples." As soon as the degree of violence subsided, these "prisons of peoples" inevitably collapsed. Therefore, in the modern world of civilised states, the term "empire" survives only as a historical name.

As the planet's territories develop, global connectivity grows, and technology advances, this biological principle, which has become the basis of the social order, has not only become a brake on development but also a full-fledged threat to all of humanity. This threat is manifested by the real possibility of the human species' self-destruction and the destruction of its habitat by weapons of mass destruction or the uncoordinated, barbaric exploitation of natural resources. It is also manifested by the inability to join efforts to prevent and confront common existential challenges and threats, such as epidemics, climate change, and asteroids.

A particular social order can be represented in the form of relations between the members of society. Thus, we can talk about rational (reasonable, unifying) and irrational (competitive, animal) relationships.

The entire human history can be described as a confrontation between natural, rational spiritual principles and irrational animal biological instincts.

In the late Middle Ages we see attempts of society to free itself from the power of military feudal lords through the revival of communal and spiritual principles. Thus, urban communities based on self-government and direct democracy of trade and professional communities (guilds), their associations and unions (Hanseatic League, Mediterranean Unions) began to form from rural communities.

Following M. Weber, T. Parsons notes that "the Church had to be articulated with secular structures at strategic points. Weber insisted that the European urban community was one such strategic point. As far as church membership was concerned, social distinctions within urban communities were, to a certain extent, muted, though not altogether eliminated. For example, all members of the urban community were given access to Mass, regardless of their social status." In contrast, in rural communities suppressed by feudal lords, "the common pattern was for the lord of the manor to attend mass in his chapel whereas the commoners in his service attended church in the village or at a nearby monastery or town, if at all" (Parsons, 1971, pp. 38-39).

Religion played a significant and globalising role in these processes, spreading the norms of church law and social life based on rational spiritual principles to an unlimited range of territories and peoples. Religious, and in fact, spiritual law, as well as church arbitration, became the highest level of supranational law in Europe, combined perfectly with the spiritual and communal traditions of the peoples. At this stage, spiritual law and church justice could be viewed as a vertical system of checks and balances against feudal force and arbitrariness.

Religious orders that were organised and had extraterritorial jurisdiction, and that were subordinate to the supreme ecclesiastical authority, became a serious alternative to feudal chiefdoms and emerging states. They were a precursor to global, supranational activist movements based on networked socio-media globalisation.

The Renaissance was driven by emerging feudal states whose main goal was to free themselves from the unifying rationality of the Church by appealing to individual and collective archetypes of personal egoism, consumerism, the cult of the body, and animal instincts. They cleverly and dexterously substituted global spiritual principles with collective egoism, an archetypal distrust of the "alien", group greed and aggression. They formed and imposed imagined communities on society, pitting them against each other in their struggle for resources and power.

This triumph of chaos and irrationality gave rise to the image of autocratic Westphalian-type monarchies, in which a ruling elite appropriated community power, replaced spirituality with ideology and traditional law with legislative arbitrariness.

This was only possible due to secularisation and the destruction of the church's transnational power, which was divided and limited by state power. This led to the destruction of the moral and value consensus in society. It also explains the physical extermination of religious orders in favour of the new nation-state.

In this way, the modern social order — based on irrational competitive relations as a manifestation and continuation of the biological programme of natural selection — was finally established.

Subsequent popular revolutions did not change this social paradigm. The sovereignty proclaimed by the people was successfully appropriated by the financial and economic elite through the bribery of bureaucrats and representatives, and the creation of a quasi-public propaganda sphere by broadcast media. Furthermore, this appropriated sovereignty began to safely flow into the hands of global associations of the financial and economic elite, as well as international TNCs and banks.

The final "triumph" of this irrational social order came with the totalitarian regimes of the 20th century, which adopted the pure biological principles of Social Darwinism and Malthusianism and organised a world war and mass genocide.

Following the global tragedy of the World War II and the subsequent rise in technology and global connectivity, there has been a shift towards the rationalisation of the social order through the establishment of supranational governance structures and international human rights law. However, due to the appropriation of states and the competitive nature of politics and capitalism, no meaningful supranational regulation has been established. Against the backdrop of the fetishisation of state sovereignty, this has largely remained a declaration of intent.

The main actors in international affairs were still state governments made up of professional politicians and lobbyists. This has led to groupthink and an even greater confrontation between economic and political groups. The modern helplessness of the UN is due to the fact that it has not evolved into a union of nations, but has remained a union of governments. Politics based on irrational, competitive behaviour — essentially Aristotle's "pleonexia"

— is incapable of meeting the challenges of unifying global efforts for the sake of common development and prosperity.

Today, it is fashionable to speak of the crisis of democracy and the devaluation of law. But is this really the case?

The "crisis of democracy" should be understood as a crisis of parliamentarism and representative power in general. The reasons for this are that, under the formal sovereign — the people — the manifestation of this sovereignty is in the hands of politicians and lobbyists who are completely dependent on the money and influence of the financial elite. This elite controls the money needed to finance elections and to manipulate public opinion through the quasi-public sphere created by the media they control.

But the crisis of legal regulation stems from the absence of widely accepted fundamental principles, where legislation merely reflects the will of the international ruling elite and is presented as law.

Thus, we can conclude that the modern social order is characterised by the absence of people's sovereignty and democracy (i.e. the power of the majority), as well as the supremacy of law. Due to spiritual principles being substituted for opportunistic ideology, publicity being substituted for behind-the-scenes politics (transactions conducted behind society's back), the merger of powers, and communities not participating in judicial proceedings, the absolute power of ruling groups — "absolutät" — actually prevails.

Under these conditions, rights, freedoms and property itself are replaced by the illusion of them. There is an illusion of rights when they are limited by the will of the ruling elite, an illusion of freedom within the framework of limited choices, and an illusion of property when possession of real

estate, for example, is not connected to the land and does not guarantee its non-seizure. In the context of the appropriated state, the drain of sovereignty and the substitution of law by Legist legislation, the individual himself is relegated to the status of a slave of the "neo-feudal" system, and loses his subjectivity.

Global oligarchic power is appropriating more and more power and judicial authority, gradually turning the world into its own corporation. As M. Creveld says, "organizations and people whose wealth and status are independent of the state, internationally oriented, and prepared to take advantage of opportunities that are opening up in every field from global communication and trade to providing private education stand to gain; and, as several analysts have argued, areal ready gaining at the expense of all the rest. With the state weakening, many of them will undoubtedly find it both easier and more necessary to translate whatever advantages they have into direct political power. Instead of merely lobbying and bribing, as is the case today, they will rule — at least by carrying some of the functions of government, in regard to some people, and to some extent" (Creveld, 1999, p. 420).

This is unsurprising and perfectly natural. If natural selection and competition presuppose the emergence and growth of leadership, then the final stage of such a "race" is a single world leader (interest group) that subjugates, exploits, and destroys its less fortunate competitors — entire peoples, races, or states. This is followed by an internal struggle within the group for the rest of the depleting natural resources (the fodder base, which is also subject to merciless exploitation), and the result will be extinction. It is the natural and logical end of the dominant biological species in the evolutionary bioprogramme paradigm.

So, the distinctive features of the irrational social order can be identified as follows:

- the secularisation and rejection of spiritual principles and traditions;
- the imposition of artificial identities;
- competition and struggle for resources and territories;
- market and political competition;
- essential capitalism and the use of human beings as bio-resources;
- mediacracy and the quasi-public sphere;
- bureaucracy and ritualisation;
- professional behind-the-scenes politics and lobbying;
- the forced achievement and maintenance of inequality, including through its normative entrenchment.

If we were a common animal primate species, such degradation (decivilisation) would be inevitable. In this case, "there must come a limit, of course, when the social order to endure accepts violent means to suppress violent disorder. And we shall then see an endless procession of concentration camps, death penalties, public whippings, and police ascendancy," pessimistically predicts R. Ardrey (Ardrey, 1970, p. 354).

Now that the potential for development through violence and competition has clearly been exhausted, a qualitative leap in the evolutionary development of humanity is required: a transition to implementing the spiritual principles of mutual acceptance and the global unification of efforts for the sake of civilisation's shared future. We must return to the original principles of transparency and direct community democracy in society's management, utilising modern information and communication network technologies for data exchange. This is the essence of the global revolution.

Today, the growth of global connectivity in all sectors is characterised by two multidirectional trends: the strengthening of international socio-media integration within society and, at the same time, the growth of political confrontation (disintegration) between states and their political blocs.

This demonstrates the concurrent reinforcement of both "right" integral relations between individuals, which are forming a global civil society through socio-media globalisation, and "wrong" competitive relations within the obsolete political and economic models of the current social order.

The contradiction between the new integral doctrine and the outdated social order creates the conditions for a global revolution: a people's initiative to change the existing social order and model of economic development.

The biological principles of natural selfishness and the struggle for survival can be contrasted with the spiritual, biblical principle of loving one's neighbour as oneself. This Old Testament principle of unity and mutual acceptance (or tolerance) within ancient tribes and peoples was crucial to their survival in a cruel ancient world.

The great wisdom of the New Testament lies in Christ's divine foresight of the development of society and globalisation, and the fact that this principle will one day be necessary for all of humanity. This principle is indispensable for overcoming a more dangerous form of egoism: collective group egoism. In contrast, the Torah covenants aimed to subdue the instincts of the individual within the community.

The true value of Scripture can be grasped by present generations because the progressive ideals of liberty,

equality, and fraternity of modern civil society are based on biblical principles that were adopted and reworked by the Age of Enlightenment and bourgeois revolutions to form a social doctrine of modern civil society that could not exist without religious thought.

Despite globalisation being an objective historical process that fosters a new, unified consciousness through information exchange and access to common technologies, rulers who seize power have, for thousands of years, been artificially imposing group identities — what B. Anderson calls "imagined communities" — on society (Anderson, 1991, pp. 5-6).

Manipulating society according to the principle of "divide and conquer" is made possible due to the appeal to the collective unconscious, archetypes that are awakened in society through collective media rituals and ritual violence. The collective unconscious is not a shared culture, but rather a deep, animal instinct, inherent in everyone and passed on genetically from common ancestors. Thus, as R. Ardrey wrote, "if the social mechanisms are a portion of our animal legacy, then we may understand why they are so difficult to control" (Ardrey, 1970, p. 372).

C. Jung spoke about the collective unconscious as an archetype, which is a complex of instincts, on the basis of which common typical perceptions are developed and on their basis standard reactions to certain life situations are already formed. "This innate, deep layer I call the collective unconscious. I chose the term 'collective' because this part of the unconscious is universal rather than individual in nature. In contrast to the personal component of the psyche, it includes patterns of behaviour and contents that are found in everyone. In other words, the collective unconscious is the

same in all people, forming a universal psychic substratum of a superpersonal nature that is present in each of us," he wrote (Jung, 2019, p. 8).

Forming artificial identities like nations, cultures, political parties, the elites who have appropriated power use collective rituals that appeal to the archetypes of the pack struggling for resources and survival against "alien hostile packs". In this process, collective rituals are used to incite mass aggression and mutual collective hatred.

History is actively substituted with historical myth, which is designed to justify the eternity and inevitability of confrontation between artificial identities. The cult of war and fallen heroes provides an example and an excuse for the repeated use of violence to solve political disputes. Public persecution and the massacre of dissenters also have the character of ritualistic violence. Using these methods, propaganda mass media controlled by the ruling elites broadcast such ideologies and actions into mass consciousness, turning them into collective media rituals. They create an artificial quasi-public sphere in which an irreconcilable struggle against "aliens" is presented as a real existential challenge to society.

Through rituals and archetypes, interest groups that have appropriated sovereignty impose an aggressive, competitive paradigm on society, making it a participant in the global ruling clans' struggle for power, territories, and resources.

In commodity and financial markets, economic competition inevitably imposes its selfish will on politics, transforming financial power into political power.

At the level of the state, political and economic selfishness within groups seeks to combine in order to

turn society into an instrument of its competitive struggle. During the crisis of parliamentarism and representation, the fusion of powers leads to the emergence of the deep state, which inevitably falls under the control of the global oligarchy.

The tools of the irrational collective unconscious used by rulers were initially sectarian and inter-religious enmity. Later, politicians adopted racism, nationalism and fundamentalism.

There is a misconception that the underdeveloped political regimes of the global periphery are prone to xenophobia, fundamentalism and dictatorship. However, this is difficult to accept given that the very nature of politics involves organised ritual violence and collective competition. Any politics that draws on the energy of the irrational collective unconscious (the "inner beast") has the potential to lead civilisation to suicidal violence.

The only way to keep this collective ego within reasonable bounds is to have genuine laws based on a common, supranational spiritual tradition — the "cage" for such an "inner beast".

Genuine law should be based on a shared spiritual tradition (religious principles and precepts), be international in nature and have absolute supremacy and immutability, meaning that all acts and actions at international and national levels are subject to its principles and norms.

This was initially transnational religious law and justice in Europe and Asia. However, the desire of states to get rid of such control gradually succeeded. The result was the triumph of the irrational instinctive principle, when state power, in essence, became only a means of exploitation and appropriation of property, and in form degenerated into a system of ritual violence.

Any state, as an apparatus of organised violence, seeks to free itself from the constraints of law. In order to restrain such aspirations, global law must embody universal spiritual principles, providing a universal constraint on the irrational nature of any political power that relies on the animal part of human nature.

This represents the great original balance between rational (spiritual) and irrational (animal) principles, and between good and evil, Light and darkness.

Spirituality can be regarded as the highest supra-personal level of rationality, where the subject is the whole of humanity outside of time, its past, future and present. Such a spirit reigned in the primary human community.

Socio-media network globalisation is the great technology of freedom, the natural process of restoring universal informational, mental, emotional and spiritual connectivity, correcting interpersonal relationships distorted by biological instincts through society-imposed competition and aggression (politics and markets), manifested in the reunification of the great human family into a new global informational spiritual community.

Contemporary research confirms the influence of socio-media technologies. It notes that, "from the invention of the internet, successive waves of digitally networked technologies have been welcomed by social scientists and commentators as providing the means both to widen participation in discussion of matters of common concern (the public sphere model, following Habermas) and for subordinate groups to self-organise and resist forms of oppression based on media and political elites' symbolic domination of society through the mass media (the emancipatory model, following Castells)" (Herbert & Fischer-Hoirem, 2021, p. 1).

Since community is the natural and only form of existence for the joint survival and prosperity of humankind, it is this spiritual community or brotherhood that the Gospel of Christ speaks to us about. The return of right social relations based on true spirituality and manifested in global law is possible only through overcoming personal and collective egoism on the basis of the supreme spiritual principle of mutual acceptance and mutual assistance — the love of neighbour — through a paradigm shift in the social order.

The global community should act as the sole source of the supreme will of the peoples — global sovereignty — and be built on the following principles:

- spirituality;
- universal equality and mutual respect;
- freedom and the value of the individual;
- social justice (subsidiarity);
- mutual assistance and mutual trust (surety);
- rational integration and non-violence for a shared future;
- direct public democracy and activism (global people power).

Modern researchers confirm that "we are now more than a decade into the era of social media and taken-for-granted fast internet connection in many parts of the world, and we are now in a very different phase in the evolution of datafied social orders" (Couldry, 2021, p. 14).

In the current circumstances, elevating the spiritual principles common to civilisation to the status of the supreme norm of global law of nations, and incorporating them into a global constitution adopted through digital direct democracy, would truly manifest and triumph the rule of law at a global level.

Transferring the supreme law-making function to global direct online democracy, while retaining distributed administration functions at the national level, will create a system of vertical checks and balances, guaranteeing against the usurpation and arbitrariness of national authorities.

Personal participation in global online voting should be a right for every legally capable inhabitant of the planet and should certainly be voluntary. However, such participation could be encouraged by an increase in social status, fostering growth in individual involvement, activity, responsibility, and civic self-consciousness of the personality.

This approach is the only possibility of a global evolutionary leap from an irrational bioprogramme leading to inevitable self-destruction (extinction), to a global rational unification into a world community striving to be Civilisation the Creator.

Possible objections to this approach might be the fear of limiting the state sovereignty of subjects of international law which do not voluntarily recognise the supremacy of global norms. However, even Jean Bodin, the author of the concept of the sovereign state, did not refer to the will of the sovereign — at that time, an absolute monarch — issues regulated by religion and tradition (Bodin, 2000, p. 138). In this case, we can talk about the supremacy of global legal norms based on spiritual and religious principles as a natural "super sovereignty" of the supreme "super sovereign" — the Creator and the global community.

Throughout almost all of human history until the total secularisation of society by states at the beginning of the 20th century, such "super sovereignty" was the norm, as any sovereignty was deemed to come from God and was not

questioned. In fact, before the Westphalian period, no rulers claimed absolute power. Thus, the proposed concept of the supremacy of global law represents a return to the centuries-old tradition of a hierarchy of sovereignties.

Sceptics may also argue that the tendency towards irrational behaviour is genetically inherent in human beings and that global law cannot change human "nature".

Of course, instant and universal correction of relations in society cannot be achieved. However, changing the social order and economic principles in accordance with global spiritual principles will limit irrational competition at all levels and encourage the formation of high goals and ideals. These will gradually change everyone, generation by generation.

The gradual implementation of biblical commandments in the international and national laws of most modern states over the past two thousand years has made violations socially unacceptable and punishable, although such phenomena have not yet been completely eradicated.

The speed of technological and social change, and the density of connections within society — what is called progress — is increasing exponentially. This gives us reason to hope that the set goals will be achieved more quickly.

To limit the use of irrational political violence by states and eradicate the abuse of criminal law, as well as to avoid numerous cases of harassment of travellers, especially travellers in transit, due to differences in criminal laws, consideration could be given to creating a single, closed list of acts that violate the most important spiritual precepts of the world's religions and should be considered as true crimes by the legislators of any country at the global level.

All other offences not included in such a global list would be considered as administrative offences against the rules of governance in a particular state. Sanctions for such administrative offences should be in the form of fines or restrictions only, and should not include penal sanctions. The use of the death penalty, as contrary to the basic spiritual and biblical principle of the value of the life of creation, should be permanently excluded at the global level. The formation of such a list should be seen as an exercise by global society of its sovereignty in this area of law.

The primary purpose of global law is to prevent and limit war and violence at all levels.

The state-appropriating elites have already faced a significant problem with the subordination of society. Thus, modern society, which is highly globalised and connected through networks, unlike its non-globalised and uneducated ancestors, is clearly not ready to participate and sacrifice itself in armed conflicts for the interests of competing world elites. Modern man is not ready to obediently kill and be killed in the confrontation between the "neo-feudalists" of the "Wars of the Roses".

In these circumstances, the stake is made on the military power of private military companies. History shows that a more or less serious confrontation requires forceful professional associations that surpass regular armies in size and capabilities, which, of course, is expensive and unsafe for the elites themselves. At any moment, these private armies could become tools of competitors or simply revolt, as the Roman legions did. Ruling elites need an operational instrument of force that does not require the loyalty or involvement of the electorate. Ideally, this would be an army of robots.

At present, the only convenient tool of the developed states in the armed confrontation is nuclear weapons, at least tactical ones, to legalise the use of which they are consistently approaching, abandoning the policy of limiting nuclear weapons. All this creates a high and real existential threat to the future of humanity and the planet.

Disconnected from the society governments, "privatised" by TNCs and the global oligarchy, have invested heavily in propaganda to convince the public of their competence, omnipotence, and ability to respond to any threat. What about all the propaganda films on this topic?

However, the real existential crisis of the COVID-19 epidemic has revealed the helplessness and failure of international institutions and the confusion and inability of most politicians to make a co-operative global response to this threat. The same ineffective response is seen in the face of global climate change. The threat of an asteroid impact is also on the horizon. There are reasonable doubts about the natural origin of the past pandemic, which may well have been the result of irresponsible government institutions.

It can be assumed that the political crisis that followed the epidemic, initiated by politicians and related to their attempts to slow down the processes of socio-media globalisation and to pit the population of countries against each other, is a planned scenario of the global oligarchy to restore the authority and positions of politicians in society.

Naturally, violence, militarism and McCarthyism are the only areas in which they can still exert influence. We can recall the warnings of V. Vernadsky, who, in the middle of the last century, wrote that "this process — the full settlement of the biosphere by humans — is conditioned

by the course of the history of scientific thought. It is inseparably connected with the speed of communication, the success of travel technology and the possibility of instantaneous thought transmission and simultaneous discussion everywhere on the planet. The struggle against this main historical current forces its ideological opponents to submit to it. State formations that do not recognise the equality and unity of all people are trying to stop their spontaneous manifestation without hesitation. However, there can hardly be any doubt that these utopian dreams will not be firmly realised" (Vernadsky, 2013, p. 19).

This confirms once again the inconsistency between the existing social order and the UN's declared goals for the sustainable development of humanity, as set out in Resolution A/RES/70/1, adopted on 21 October 2015. It is indicative that none of the set seventeen goals has been achieved, and in all likelihood will not be achieved by the efforts of states and politicians by the year 2030 (UN Secretary General to world leaders in Seville...).

Freedom technologies and global law have the potential to eradicate inequality, a key cause of violence in society.

Slavery is an institution that has existed in human society for centuries, arising from violence against our own kind. The purpose of ancient empires and proto-states was not only to appropriate the territories and labour of peoples captured by violence, but also to appropriate their population itself by force.

From generation to generation, people were born and lived as the property of the ruling elites who owned them. Christian spirituality has played a significant role in eliminating this situation by consistently instilling the idea of the value of every human being, created in the image and likeness of God, into humanity.

For a long time, the barbarism of slavery has been concealed under the mask of feudalism or elementary racism, denying the value and freedom of every human being on one or another of these far-fetched grounds. States, as apparatuses of organised violence and appropriation, were in many ways the guarantors of this institution, enshrining the status of the exploited and exploiters in their laws.

Forms of gender or family slavery can still be found in developing societies today. This is a matter of great concern and condemnation by international human rights organisations.

It must be admitted that the real blow to the institution of slavery was the development of technology, which made mass slave labour economically inexpedient. This is the case when spirituality worked in alliance with technology for the benefit of civilisation.

It is also impossible to underestimate the influence of communication technologies such as writing and book printing in spreading spiritual and humanistic principles in society. The expansion of the public sphere facilitated dialogue and understanding between peoples, classes, estates, and confessions, which, for full communication, required recognition of the equality of its participants.

Nowadays, after numerous social transformations, most of the world's inhabitants believe that they are born free. But is this really the case, or does the illusion of freedom depend on the degree of appropriation and exploitation? Perhaps the feudal dependent citizens of the Middle Ages also felt a taste of freedom compared to their enslaved ancestors in the Roman Empire.

Today, everyone is born a citizen. Everyone acquires citizenship or nationality by virtue of being born in the territory of a state (*jus soli* — "right of soil") or through

the citizenship (nationality) of their parents (*jus sanguinis* — "right of blood"). This obviously excludes any freedom of choice on the part of those acquiring such a status.

Modern state doctrine considers citizenship to be a social contract between citizens and the state, expressing popular sovereignty.

At the same time, however, the emergence of a citizen's civil obligations to the state has an innate, non-contractual character. Renouncing citizenship is often associated with significant difficulties and expenses, and requires establishing relations with another state — especially given international policy aims to reduce the number of stateless persons.

Considering citizenship in this way, we can speak of the imputed nature of the relationship between the individual and the state.

Consequently, social and economic inequalities between states are automatically transmitted to their citizens or subjects.

Clearly, people born in different states initially have unequal rights and opportunities, depending on the development of public and state institutions, the state of the economy and ecology, and the cost of labour, which is strongly influenced by exchange rates determined by stock exchange speculation.

Can the regular "robbery" of people through inflation and exchange rates be considered fair? A couple of hundred years ago, hardly anyone would have accepted calmly the news that their savings in the form of gold or silver coins had suddenly decreased because some dealers on the international exchange had decided so. Today, for some reason, this does not surprise anyone.

The difference in labour costs in different regions of the world no longer benefits even highly developed countries.

Billions of people on the planet see forced migration as a solution to this issue, which creates tensions and conflicts in the international sphere. The days when the inhabitants of colonies worked tirelessly for food while people in world capitals danced in luxurious dresses are a thing of the past. Today, the streets of these capitals are filled with migrants, putting a huge strain on the social welfare system. It is worth seriously considering a global tariff agreement to guarantee a fair price for labour in every corner of the planet.

One reasonable solution to this issue could be global citizenship for every inhabitant of the planet, established and regulated by global legal norms.

The idea of the highest level of world citizenship originated in ancient Greece in the speeches of Socrates and Diogenes, was developed in the Renaissance by Guillaume Postel, and was finally formulated by I. Kant as "world citizenship" (*ius cosmopoliticum* in Latin) along with citizenship of states (Kant, 1965*c*, Vol. 6, Part 2, pp. 257-311). In the modern world, multiple citizenship is a very common phenomenon. Why should there not be a hierarchy of citizenship between the global and national levels?

The highest level of global citizenship, available to every inhabitant of the Earth, could guarantee a minimum volume of civil rights and freedoms on a planetary scale, independent of political and economic conditions. It could also facilitate the process of choosing national citizenship consciously, while ensuring that no one becomes stateless. This global passport could be granted to anyone on the planet upon their voluntary application, submitted online by themselves or their parents (representatives). Of course,

there should be no compulsion to possess such citizenship; its acquisition or renunciation must be voluntary.

The equality of rights and freedoms of all individuals within the framework of a single world citizenship status could embody the natural spiritual principles of freedom, equality and mutual acceptance at the planetary level. It would also solve issues regarding the recognition of individuals' statuses and powers in different states, such as educational qualifications, scientific degrees and driver's licences, without the need for additional international agreements and acts.

According to UN research, "In a 2016 GlobeScan poll of 20,000 people from 18 countries, 56 per cent of respondents in emerging economies 'saw themselves first and foremost as global citizens rather than national citizens.' In industrialized countries, self-identification with global citizenship peaked in 2009 and is now 42 per cent" (Carlin, Choi, GlobeScan).

In the history of Europe we can also see examples of the hierarchy of citizenship among the subjects of individual kingdoms and empires.

Along with the recognition of this status at a global or international level, in the soul of every believer this is in harmony with the spiritual citizenship of "politeuma" (*Πολίτευμα*, Greek) — the heavenly citizenship of the Higher World of which the Apostle Paul speaks (New Testament, Philippians 3: 20).

The model of the global transfer of sovereignty from peoples to the world civil society, which I proposed earlier in my work *Global Alternative* (Izmestyev, 2023), was criticised on the grounds that it is contrary to the sovereignty of individual peoples and states. Let us try to understand why this is not true.

In legal science, the source of state sovereignty is considered to be the sovereignty of the people as an upward manifestation of the will of the healthy majority. Thus, state sovereignty is a material manifestation of popular sovereignty and thus comes from the people inhabiting the state.

Just over half a century ago, it was not technologically possible to express the absolute will of humanity outside the power structures of individual states. "It is impossible for modern government to give equal direct participation to all citizens," wrote T. Parsons in his seminal work, *The System of Modern Societies* (Parsons, 1971, p. 82).

Now, with information and communication technologies offering connectivity and freedom, humanity has the chance to realise its direct and universal sovereignty. This is a great opportunity for our generation.

Moreover, in the context of the implementation of the idea of global transit of sovereignty, there is a possibility of its full-fledged merger with the descending (divine) sovereignty, through the global vote confirming the highest spiritual principles and principles of world religions as the basis of global law. Such a voluntary adoption of spiritual principles and principles as the highest norms of world law by the will of a healthy world majority can mean the merger of the sovereignties of the ascending popular and descending divine sovereignties. The result of such a merger would be an absolute manifestation of the will of humanity, the essence of the will of peoples, and the wisdom of past generations that developed these spiritual principles and traditions.

In such a construct, the descending divine and ascending popular sovereignties would no longer be opposed to each

other, but would instead unite harmoniously in a single manifestation of the absolute will of the peoples.

Since all nations, states, unions and associations are the result of humanity being artificially divided into imaginary communities for manipulation by interested groups, the only natural association created by nature itself is people's biological identity as a species.

In this logic, thanks to the global direct expression of will, a certain "singularity" of the will of mankind as a global information community, in conjunction with spiritual principles and traditions, the highest level of law is born. A great consensus, the absolute of the world will, appears before us in the image of the global constitution; a new "sun" rises over the world, creating the ideal of the world social order, a new era, a new world.

The value of this "singularity" of sovereignty also lies in the fact that all our ancestral generations, whose wisdom in organising communal life is embedded in spiritual principles and traditions, participate in this act of will.

Is this not an embodiment of P. Teilhard de Chardin's and V. Vernadsky's ideas about "Humanity the Creator" and the noosphere, whereby "under the influence of scientific thought and human labour, the biosphere is transitioning to a new state — the noosphere" (Vernadsky, 2013, p. 13)?

We have already drawn a comparison between the global initiative and society's acceptance of world religions. In a sense, isn't the universal affirmation of moral and religious principles as the highest level of law a new covenant between people and God? This fusion of spirituality and science, when "Religion and science are the two conjugated faces or phases of one and the same complete act of knowledge — the only one which can embrace the past

and future of evolution so as to contemplate, measure and fulfil them" (Teilhard de Chardin, 2008, p. 285), described by P. Teilhard de Chardin, is also a "singularity" in our understanding of the world. The importance of such a step cannot be overstated.

Communication technologies of freedom give rise to a global public sphere and human community and are capable of generating an unprecedented force by combining the will of thousands of generations into the "singularity" of our self-awareness. This will not only change the paradigm of human consciousness from division to unity and from competition to solidarity, but it will also create an ideal social order.

The resulting higher level of global law — the absolute expression of human will and spiritual morality — will become the ultimate embodiment of the ideal of human existence and the supreme embodiment of the principle of the supremacy of law on a global scale.

At the same time, the sovereignty of states is not diminished in any way, as it is naturally linked to global sovereignty as its partial reflection in the self-governance of territories, as its sublevel. It should be noted that state sovereignty has never been absolute. In the Middle Ages we observe a complex hierarchy of sovereignties of feudal society. Even J. Bodin himself excluded spiritual principles and traditions established by families, peoples, and the Church from the concept of absolute sovereignty (Bodin, 2000, p. 138). A system of limited sovereignties is also present in federal states.

It should not be neglected that the process of appropriation of state sovereignty by transnational economic and financial structures, global oligarchy, and its replacement by ritual functions and bureaucracy (ritualisation of

states) is inevitable and objective. This is manifested in the appropriation of states, degradation of representative democracy and corruption of officialdom, manipulation of public opinion, audience democracy and mediacracy, when the sovereignty of peoples is increasingly replaced by the absolutism of specific politicians or globalised groups of influence.

Any slowdown in globalisation processes at an international level is easily compensated for in the social media sphere, given the speed with which information, thoughts, images and feelings are exchanged today. What took years or months to convey to the whole world a hundred years ago is now transmitted in a matter of hours, or even minutes. An increasing number of people around the world are becoming involved in this public information sphere. An example of this is the instantaneous dissemination of publications, videos and other digital content. This is how a unified consciousness of humanity is formed.

The only condition for a return to the isolated societies and cultures of the nation-states of the past can only be a total rejection of the technologies of information, commodity exchange and transport communication that are integral to the concept of progress itself.

Socio-media globalisation should not be simplistically regarded as only a process whereby individuals cooperate online to achieve common goals or solve joint tasks, creating temporary socio-media relations and information flows for this purpose. The author of this concept of "network society", modern Spanish sociologist M. Castells, reasonably notes, "In the last resort, it is only the power of global civil society acting on the public mind via the media and communication networks that may eventually overcome the historical inertia

of nation-states and thus bring these nation-states to accept the reality of their limited power in exchange for increasing their legitimacy and efficiency" (Castells, 2009, p. 42).

In these circumstances, the only way to keep sovereignty in the hands of peoples is its natural and inevitable transit to the level of global civil society: a single information community, and the global public sphere. This is society's last chance to preserve people's power and a capable state in the face of globalisation.

Without such a transition, sovereignty will inevitably be completely appropriated by globalised interest groups, leading to the creation of a global superstate-corporation and the threat of worldwide dictatorship. Unfortunately, there is no other option.

CONCLUSION (FINDINGS)

Now that we understand the alternative and the prospect of influencing the existing social order, I propose we consider possible tangible steps to achieve our goal of changing it.

Networking technologies of freedom, together with increasing levels of information exchange and socio-media globalisation, are a necessary condition for influencing the principles and foundations of social order.

Of course, the existence of a single global social order is open to debate. Until now, many researchers have only discussed a set of social orders at national and regional levels.

Here, first of all, it is necessary to speak about the normative social order, which is based on the concept of the "European state" and is enshrined as an ideal in the constitutions of many modern countries of the world, with some peculiarities, of course. A kind of export of such a model of society initially spread through social and revolutionary transformations in the most developed countries of the world, and then was adopted by national liberation movements at the collapse of the world colonial system in the first half of the 20th century.

In addition, the principles of international politics and economic relations between countries are manifested in international law, which was formed under the patronage of the world's most developed countries.

With the growth of globalisation at the beginning of our 21st century, it can be argued that the Western European model of social and economic system can well be

considered as valid for most of the modern world and as a normatively declared ideal for the majority of other nations. This is confirmed by the studies of the modern legal scholar A. Savenkov, who asserts the "universalisation of the social order" for the regulation of which "it is necessary to revive the civilisational significance of the role of law in the modern world" (Savenkov, 2020, pp. 167, 411).

Thus, it is quite acceptable to speak of a global social order comprising politics and markets, which can be considered the initial state of modern society.

The very process of spiritual revival (transformation) itself could be defined as the reverse of the political transformation associated with the emergence of the modern Westphalian state and capitalist market systems, manifested in the appropriation of popular sovereignty and the state as a social institution by interest groups.

The process of state appropriation itself was facilitated by the lack of a common communicative and public space due to the territorial isolation of peoples, the absence of effective channels of communication and the impossibility of individual citizens to participate in the management of public affairs in vast territories. The removal of supranational religious associations from social governance eroded the unified ideal of a social structure based on common spiritual principles and values.

Today's online means of information exchange remove these restrictions, enabling every owner of a device connected to the World Wide Web anywhere on the planet — including via mobile or satellite communication — to participate in the instant exchange of information and confirm their identity by means of digital identification.

The existing social media platforms (services) on the Web are a universal platform for public discussion and people-to-people diplomacy, actively shaping global civil society, and at the same time are its effective prototype.

In this case, discourse and values are unified by strengthening cultural globalisation and forming a common socio-cultural community, while language differences are levelled out by built-in online translation systems that are constantly improving, including through AI. The common agenda is formed and ensured within the social media environment itself.

Until recently, the main actors in world politics were the governments of individual nation states or their authorised bodies. However, with the growth of globalisation, leadership and sovereignty have begun to actively shift towards the owners and managers of transnational corporations, international financial institutions, broadcast media, and information platforms.

In the absence of common norms and principles for regulating international relations and clear leadership from strong players capable of establishing world order through their agreements, it is clear that all spheres of international life are becoming chaotic. The force of law is increasingly being replaced by the crude biological principle of the law of force.

According to the international organisation Oxfam, which fights inequality, the concentration of 43 per cent of all property and capital in the hands of a small globalised elite representing one per cent of the world's population had already reached this level by the beginning of 2024 (Oxfam).

In a global society united by socio-media connectivity, there is a growing demand for a just social order based not on

inequality and violence, but on moral principles of rational integration manifested in the spiritual culture of civilisation, which could be called a spiritual social (normative social) order.

In fact, the just request of legal science for a moral state (Baburin, 2020, p.14) can be realised only by placing the state, being an apparatus of organised violence and coercion, under the authority of the moral law of the supreme supranational level. For what such a moral law should be proclaimed by the sovereign, who is represented by global civil society.

Today, this new society is represented by global activist movements that arise to protect the rights and interests of people around the world on specific issues and in specific sectors. These movements are formed and connected through networked social media platforms.

In fact, international communities of traditional transnational religious believers, which have existed throughout the world for a long time, can also be considered historically established global associations of activists.

Thus, these associations of activists and believers, united by online social media services, as well as any global public associations, and even individual states or their alliances, can be the initiators of changes in the foundations of the social order.

It can be assumed that the basis for unification could be one or more social media platforms created on the basis of shared values and goals. These could be separate platforms or associations based on widespread social networks such as groups, forums and channels. It is particularly important that these networks or platforms ensure maximum openness and transparency in discourse, without censorship or content filtering.

Alongside the union of governments that the UN is today, such a global forum could become a genuine union of peoples.

This global union of activists should be based on the idea of adopting declarations on global sovereignty, human rights and freedoms through direct online voting. This would establish the foundations of world order in the form of a global constitution based on the shared spiritual and traditional values of civilisation.

Clearly, the world will see new founding fathers of global law. Only unity and activism will enable us to recognise the overwhelming majority of people who support the pursuit of spiritual values and traditions. This could elevate the voice of the healthy majority above any deviation.

Joining such an internet community should imply supporting its declarations and a fact of acquiring global citizenship status. Within this discussion space, a draft global constitution should be developed, as well as mechanisms for direct online democracy. Global citizens should be assigned unique identifiers that allow them to exercise their rights and freedoms within the global information society.

Existing states, governments, political parties and social movements should be given every opportunity to participate in and contribute to the creation of such a global community and movement. The world civil forum will need to establish a system of interaction with the UN, functioning as a global forum of governments.

As the number of participants in the global forum increases, so will its authority and influence over social and political processes worldwide, including through the gradual recognition and accession of existing state and public structures.

Legally, the global forum should not contradict existing mechanisms of social governance. It should provide international political actors with powerful feedback in the form of a manifestation of the collective will of the new global society. Politicians will no longer be able to speculate on the interests of the population, as the global majority's real opinion on any significant issue will be made public and accessible to all.

The importance of such an institution as an arbitrator in political or economic disputes, to whose judgement States may voluntarily submit certain disputes, cannot be underestimated.

Thanks to modern computing capabilities and AI, the results of online voting can be processed and interpreted rapidly. There will be no need for millions of polling stations to count votes. Additionally, AI can promote self-organisation and information exchange on social media platforms, maximising the potential of each participant.

The global system of direct democracy created by the forum should be institutionalised through international law. Cooperation and alliances between the UN and the world civil forum will give new impetus and meaning to the development of this international organisation. I am confident that, if there is goodwill, the UN will find a way to recognise or approve acts of global democracy.

The main goal of the global forum is to develop and adopt a global constitution based on the shared spiritual principles of world religions. This constitution would embody the moral ideals of a new global humanity born from a consensus, a desire for eternal peace, and a collective vision for the future.

Regardless of what politicians and nationalists say on this subject, it follows from the above that finding this

consensus is much easier than it seems, since the true traditional and spiritual values of the world's peoples, who are faithful to the Covenants of the Creator, cannot and should not be anything other than the spiritual principles of the world's religions. These values are remarkably similar due to their unity of goals, meaning and common origin — the great Light of eternal reason.

We also need to define such a normatively defined value ideal due to the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI), which has been made possible by the development of information technologies. In the near future, AI will enhance universal connectivity and create incredible new opportunities for humanity in all spheres of life. It will, of course, embrace the ethical norms and principles of the society that created it. Technological breakthroughs have always changed the course of history increasing our connectivity. In order to prevent these advances from becoming yet another round of escalating threats, struggles and self-destruction, we require a new social order based on shared moral and spiritual principles. Only in this way can we prevent the fruits of progress from turning against humanity itself, as the author of the concept of the moral state, S. Baburin, says: "Modern technological society can save the human in itself only through the appeal to the national religious traditions of peoples" (Baburin, 2023, p. 25).

The executive structures of the states of the near future will probably be based on algorithms, using their logic, impartiality and objectivity, as well as the spiritual values that should be at their core. After all, without pure rationality and impartiality of algorithms it is impossible to defeat corruption and abuse of power in the state apparatus, which are always rooted in ordinary human egoism, emotions and

instincts. It is obvious that a common future can only be the result of a harmonious combination of spirituality and technology.

Current generations, who are becoming aware of their planetary unity for the first time, must form a single social ideal in alliance with the wisdom and traditions of past generations and enshrine it in the supreme norms. This process is similar to how our ancestors created and adopted the principles and values of faith, which over time improved our world. Today, our technologies and history itself present us with a significant opportunity that we cannot afford to miss.

"So even though we face the difficulties of today and tomorrow, I still have a dream," said the renowned human rights defender and activist, Martin Luther King, Jr. a little over sixty years ago. Soon, by the will of the healthy majority, his dream became a reality.

Today, a new world based on equality, openness, solidarity, and founded on the Covenants of our Creator, is the dream of billions of people on the planet. And it has the right to come true.

Believing in a dream turns it into a hope. In the face of the harsh laws of nature and the silent cosmos, we must rely on ourselves and each other because the Kingdom of God is within us.

20 April 2025

Bibliography

Books, monographs

In English

1. Anderson B. (1991) Imagined Communities Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. London, NY: Verso. 224 p. ISBN 0-86091-329-5.

2. Ardrey R. (1970) The Social Contract: A Personal Inquiry into the Evolutionary Sources of Order and Disorder. NY: Atheneum, 405 p.

3. Armstrong K. (2014) Fields of Blood: Religion and the History of Violence. New York, Toronto: Alfred A. Knopf. 512 p.

4. Bourdieu P. (2014) On the State: Lectures at the College de France (1989-1992). Edited by Patrick Champagne, Remi Lenoir, Franck Poupeau and Marie-Christine Riviere. Translated by David Fernbach. Cambridge: Polity Press. 450 p.

5. Castells M. (2009) Communication Power. NY: Oxford University Press. 571 p.

6. Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church (2004). Vatican: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. 224 p. ISBN 88-209-7716-8.

7. Corrigan P., Sayer D. (1985) The Great Arch: English State Formation as Cultural Revolution. Oxford: Blackwell. 268 p.

8. Creveld M. (1999) The Rise and Decline of the State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 439 p. ISBN 0-521-65190-5.

9. Francis (2015) Encyclical Letter LAUDATO SI'. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana. 87 p.

10. Giddens A. (2002) Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives. London: Profile Books. 87 p.

11. Giddens A., Sutton P. (2016) Essential Concepts in Sociology. Second edition. London: Polity Press. 334 p.

12. Habermas J. (1989) The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 326 p.

13. Habermas J. (1998) The Inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory. Edited by Ciaran Cronin and Pablo De Greiff. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 340 p.

14. Hayek F. A. (1998) Law, Legislation and Liberty. Cornwall: Routledge. 646 p.

15. Hobbes Th. (2008) Leviathan. NY: Oxford University Press. 576 p.

16. Izmestyev S. (2023) Global Alternative. Moscow: Triumph Publishing. 326 p. ISBN 978-5-94472-115-0.

17. Jessop B. (2016) The State: Past, Present, and Future. London: Polity Press. 317 p.

18. Kelsen H. (1960) Pure Theory of Law. Transl. from German by Knight. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 376 p.

19. King B., Petty R. (2021) The Rise of Technosocialism: How Inequality, AI and Climate will Usher in a New World. NY: Marshall Cavendish Business. 441 p.

20. Lindblom Ch. (1977) Politics and Markets. The World's Political Economic Systems. NY: Basic Books, Inc. Publishers. 403 p.

21. Lorenz K. (2002) On Aggression. London, NY: Routledge. 320 p.

22. Magun A. (2020) The Future of the State: Philosophy and Politics. London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 286 p.

23. Malthus T. (1992) An Essay on the Principle of Population. NY: Cambridge University Press. 392 p.

24. Manin B. (1997) The Principles of Representative Government. NY: Cambridge University Press. 243 p.

25. Maslow A. (1954) Motivation and Personality. NY: Harpaer & Row. 369 p.

26. Parsons T. (1971) The system of modern societies. N. J.: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice-Hall, Inc. 152 p.

27. Rawls J. (1971) A Theory of Justice. Harvard: Harvard University Press. 628 p.

28. Thiel P., Masters B. (2014) Zero to One: Notes on Startups, or How to Build the Future. NY: Crown Business. 224 p.

29. Teilhard De Chardin P. (2008) The Phenomenon of Man. NY: Harper Perennial. 319 p.

30. Tilly Ch. (2007) Democracy. NY: Cambridge University Press. 234 p.

In Russian

1. Antonjan Ju. M. (2003) Rejection of civilisation: cannibalism, incest, infanticide, totalitarianism [*Отрицание цивилизации: каннибализм, инцест, детоубийство, тоталитаризм*] Moscow. 322 p.

2. Antonjan Ju. M. (2015*a*) The Theory of Human Aggression. Why are People Violent [*Теория человеческой агрессии. Почему жестоки люди*] Moscow. 311 p.

3. Aristotle (2011) Nicomachean Ethics [*Никомахова этика*] Moscow. 492 p.

4. Baburin S. N. (2020) The Moral State. The Russian View of the Values of Constitutionalism. [*Нравственное государство. Русский взгляд на ценности конституционализма*]. Moscow: Norma. 536 p.

5. Baburin S. N. (2022) Integration Constitutionalism: Monograph. [*Интеграционный конституционализм: монография*]. Moscow: Norma: INFRA-M. 264 p.

6. Bodin J. (2000) Method for the easy comprehension of history [*Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*]. Moscow: Nauka. 412 p.

7. Clausewitz C. (2007) On War [*О войне*]. Moscow: Eksmo, Midgard. 864 p.

8. Engels F. (1961) Anti-During. Dialectics of nature [*Анти-Дюринг. Диалектика природы*]. Marx K., Engels F. Essays. In 20 volumes. Transl. from German. Moscow: GIPL. Vol. 20, pp. 1-797. 828 p.

9. Florovsky G. (1998) Dogma and History [*Догмат и История*]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Svjato-Vladimirskogo bratstva. 488 p.

10. Jung C. (1997) Instinct and the unconscious. Consciousness and the unconscious: Collection [*Инстинкт и бессознательное. Сознание и бессознательное: Сборник*]. Translated from German. S. Peterburg: Universitetskaja kniga. pp. 57-68. 544 p.

11. Jung C. (2019) Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious [*Архетипы и коллективное бессознательное*]. Translated from German. Moscow: AST. 496 p.

12. Kant I. (1965*a*) Metaphysics of Morals [*Метафизика нравов*]. In 6 volumes. Transl. from German. Moscow: Mysl'. Vol. 4, part 2. pp. 107-437. 478 p.

13. Kant I. (1965*b*) On the common saying: this may be true in theory but it does not apply in practice [*О поговорке "Может быть, это и верно в теории, но не годится для практики"*]. In 6 volumes. Transl. from German. Moscow: Mysl'. Vol. 4, part 2. pp. 60-106. 478 p.

14. Kant I. (1965*c*) Perpetual Peace [*К вечному миру*]. In 6 volumes. Transl. from German. Moscow: Mysl'. Vol. 6, part 2. pp. 257-311. 443 p.

15. Kropotkin P. A. (2007) Mutual aid: a factor of evolution [*Взаимопомощь как фактор эволюции*]. Moscow: Samoobrazovanie. 240 p.

16. Magyar B. (2016) Anatomy of a Post-Communist Mafia State [*Анатомия посткоммунистического мафиозного государства. На примере Венгрии*]. Transl. from Hungarian. Moscow: OOO Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie. 392 p.

17. Marx K., Engels F. (1955) German ideology: Essays [*Немецкая идеология*]. In 20 volumes. Transl. from German. Moscow: GIPL. Vol. 3, pp. 7-544. 630 p.

18. Matjushkin N. I. (1954) V. I. Lenin about Friendship Between Peoples [*В. И. Ленин о дружбе народов*]. Moscow: Znanie, 40 p.

19. Ragimov I. M. (2013) Philosophy of crime and punishment [*Философия преступления и наказания*]. St. Petersburg: Juridicheskij centr. 288 p.

20. Rousseau J.-J. (1998) On the Social Contract.Treatises. [*Об общественном договоре. Трактаты*]. Moscow: KANON-press-c, Kuchkovo pole. 416 p.

21. Savenkov A. N. (2020) State and Law in the Period Crisis of Modern Civilization [*Государство и право в период кризиса современной цивилизации*]. Moscow: Prospekt. 448 p.

22. Schmitt C. (2000) Political Theology [*Политическая теология*]. Transl. from German by A. Filippov. Moscow: KANON-press-C. 336 p.

23. Vernadsky V. I. (2013) Scientific thought as a planetary phenomenon [*Научная мысль как планетное явление*]. Edited by E. M. Galimov. Collected Works : in 24 volumes. Moscow: Nauka. Vol. 10. 475 p.

Articles in periodicals and anthologies

In English

1. Couldry N. (2021) The Social Construction of Reality — Really! Social Media and Social Order. Warsaw/Berlin: De Gruyter Copyright. pp. 10-16. 139 p.

2. Herbert D., Fisher-Høyrem S. (2021) Introduction: How Do Social Media Change Social Order? The Deep Datafication of Society from Global to Local Scales (and Back Again). Social Media and Social Order. Warsaw/ Berlin: De Gruyter Copyright. pp. 1-9. 139 p.

3. Tilly Ch. (1985) War Making and State Making as Organized Crime. Bringing the State Back In edited by P. Evans, D. Rueschemeyer, and T. Skocpol. NY: Cambridge University Press. pp. 169-191.

4. Valgarðsson V., Jennings W., Stoker G., Bunting H., Devine D., Klassen A., McKay L. (2025) A Crisis of Political Trust? Global Trends in Institutional Trust from 1958 to 2019. British Journal of Political Science. No. 55 (e15). pp. 1-23.

In German

1. Schneckener U. (2003) State Collapse as a Global Threat. Fragile States and Transnational Terrorism [*Staatszerfall als globale Bedrohung*]. Internationale Politik, November 2003, pp. 11-19.

In Russian

1. Antonjan Ju. M. (2015*b*) Totalitarian crime and the collective unconscious [*Тоталитарная преступность и коллективное бессознательное*]. "LEX RUSSICA" NauchnyetrudyMGUA.Vol.CVI(№21).IssueNo.9.pp.32-49.

2. Efroimson V. P. (1971) Origin of Altruism (Ethics from the Perspective of Human Evolutionary Genetics) [*Родословная альтруизма (Этика с позиций эволюционной генетики человека)*]. Novyj mir. No. 10. pp. 193-213.

3. Pakhravova N. P. (2009) On the ethical values of the Quran [*К вопросу об этических ценностях Корана*]. Islamovedenie. No. 1. pp. 50-56.

4. Pomerants G. (2011) Under the walls of Carthage [*Под стенами Карфагена*] "Indeks": Dos'e na cenzuru. No. 13. pp. 76-90.

5. Shestakov D. A. (2012) Planetary Oligarchic Criminal Activity: The Ninth Level of Crime. [*Планетарная олигархическая преступная деятельность: девятый уровень преступности*]. Kriminologija: vchera, segodnja, zavtra. No. 2. pp. 12-22.

6. Sysoev T. (2020) Steve Fuller: "The 'State 2.0' will be a cyborg, but the person will still remain an integral part of the political process" [*Стив Фуллер: "'Государство 2.0' будет киборгом, но человек всё равно останется неотъемлемой частью политического процесса"*]. Jekspert (Expert). No. 48. pp. 54-59.

Web resources

In English

1. Carlin S., Choi Y-K. The Role of Civil Society in Advancing Global Citizenship UN website.URL: https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/role-civil-society-advancing-global-citizenship/ (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

(Global citizenship a growing sentiment among citizens of emerging economies, Global poll. GlobeScan.URL: https://www.globescan.com/news-and-analysis/press-releases/press-release (accessed on: 20.04.2025)).

2. C. I. A. Now Favors Lab Leak Theory to Explain Covid's Origins. N. Y. Times. URL: https://www.nytimes.com/2025/01/25/us/politics/cia-covid-lab-leak.html (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

3. "Fragile States Index" of 179 states. The Fund for Peace website. URL: https://fragilestatesindex.org/methodology/ (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

4.Guterres tells world leaders in Sevilla… UN News website. URL: https://news.un.org/en/story/2025/06/1165091 (accessed on: 30.06.2025).

5. "State Resilience Index". The Fund for Peace website. URL: https://www.fundforpeace.org/SRI/sim_white_paper.pdf (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

6. Turchetti M. Jean Bodin. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy Archive. URL: https://plato.stanford.edu/archIves/sum2020/entries/bodin/ (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

7. Wealth of five richest men doubles since 2020 as five billion people made poorer in "decade of division," says Oxfam. Oxfam website. URL: https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/wealth-five-richest-men-doubles-2020-five-billion-people-made-poorer-decade-division (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

In Russian

1. Correspondence of I. P. Pavlov and V. M. Molotov in 1934-1935. [*Переписка И. П. Павлова и В. М. Молотова в 1934-1935 году*]. Memorial Museum-Estate of Academician Ivan Pavlov. URL: http://www.pavlovmuseum.ru/pavlov/perepiska_ Pavlova_i_Molotova (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

Regulatory and official acts

1. UN General Assembly Resolution "Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development" A/RES/70/1 October 212015. UN website. URL: https://sdgs.un.org/sites/default/files/publications/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf (accessed on: 20.04.2025).

On the cover:

The image generated by the fourth-generation neural network Runway AI, created by Runway AI, Inc. (New York) based on the style and color scheme of the cover of the previously published book by S. Izmestyev Global Alternative, uses a satellite image of the planet Earth taken by the National Satellite Meteorological Center (NSMC, China) on March 20, 2020 at 05:00 UTC; the astronomical symbol of the planet Earth; www.izmestyev.org